DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 406 EC 202 845

AUTHOR	Houseman, Woody, Comp.
TITLE	The 1987 State of the States Gifted and Talented Education Report.
INSTITUTION	Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted.
PUB DATE	Nov 87
NOTE	143p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Nancy Lukenbill, President, Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted, Office of Public Instruction, Room 106, State Capitol, Helena, MT 59620 ($10.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Statistical Data (110)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; Delivery Systems; *Gifted; *National Surveys; Needs Assessment; Services; *State Aid; State Legislation; *State Programs; *Talent

ABSTRACT

The report, based on a survey of state directors of programs for the gifted, is intended to provide an accurate portrait of gifted education throughout the 50 states, Puerto Rico, and Guam. Data are presented tabularly and by the specific responses to survey questions for the following survey topics: state policies and practices; funding for fiscal year 1987, state support services, local education agency services, private and public collaboration, state progress/needs. For each section a summary discussion provides a national perspective on the topic considered. Sample survey findings include the following: 25 states and Guam have mandated services for the gifted/talented; data concerning state funds for gifted programs were not comparable; 47 states plus Puerto Rico and Guam have recognized gifted and talented education through specific legislation; New Jersey had the highest percentage (9.9) of students receiving services and Idaho had the smallest percentage (1.2); 18 states plus Puerto Rico listed at least one state-sponsored summer institute for training teachers of the gifted. The final section provides individual state summaries which include the state's definition of gifted/talented and a statement on current progress and areas needing improvement. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED295406

THE 1987 STATE OF THE STATES GIFTED AND TALENTED EDUCATION REPORT

The Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted

Compiled by
Woody Houseman
Kansas State Department of Education

EC 202845

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Nancy Lubenhiller
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

© Copyright 1987
Council of State Directors
of
Programs for the Gifted

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Overview		1
The Instrument		3
I.	State Policies and Practices	5
	Table I. State Policies and Practices	6
	Instrument Section I with Compilation of States	11
	National Perspective on State Policies and Practices	15
II.	Funding for Fiscal Year 1987	19
	Table II. Funding for Fiscal Year 1987	20
	Instrument Section II with Compilation of States	25
	National Perspective on Funding for Fiscal Year 1987	27
III.	State Support Services	31
	Table III. State Support Services	32
	Instrument Section III with Compilation of States	37
	National Perspective on State Support Services	41
IV.	Local Education Agency Services	45
	Table IV. Local Education Agency Services	46
	Instrument Section IV with Compilation of States	49
	National Perspective on Local Education Agency Services	53
V.	Private and Public Collaboration	57
	Table V. Private and Public Collaboration	58
	Instrument Section V with Compilation of States	61
	National Perspective on Private and Public Collaboration	63
VI.	State Progress/Needs	65
	Instrument Section VI	67
	State Responses	69

OVERVIEW

In the Fall 1986 annual meeting of the Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted, the need for an update of the 1985 State of the States Gifted and Talented Education report was discussed. Patty Bruce Mitchell reviewed with the state directors a compilation of information requested in four previous national surveys of state education agencies. These studies included: the 1985 Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted Survey; the 1981 Survey by James Gallagher for the Office of Gifted and Talented, USOE; the 1977 Survey by the Council for Exceptional Children; and the 1971 Survey conducted as part of Commissioner Marland's Report to Congress. State directors then identified those items which they believed should be included in an update of the State of the States report. The purpose was to compile information on the states in order to gain an accurate portrait of gifted education throughout the nation.

A committee was appointed to develop the questionnaire and follow through with the study. The committee, chaired by Woody Houseman (Kansas), included the following State Directors:

Lynn Cole (Maryland)
Gail Hanninen (Washington)
Nancy Lukenbill (Montana)
Paul Plowman (California)

The State of the States Committee met after the Fall 1986 CSDPG Meeting to discuss the state directors' comments regarding questions which should be addressed in the 1987 State of the States Survey. In addition, the committee agreed on the general format of the survey. Questions were developed by committee members to address individual sections of the survey. From these questions the first draft of the survey was compiled. The draft survey was revised based on input from the Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted at a March 1987 Council meeting.

The 1987 State of the States Survey was mailed in April to all state directors for the gifted, and the directors for the gifted in the United States Trust Territories. Responses were received from all 50 states, Puerto Rico and Guam.

THE INSTRUMENT

The instrument was developed to illicit clear and specific responses. This, however, was not always the result. Attempts were made to accurately interpret the responses and report the results so states could be compared. In addition, although questions were reviewed with state directors and the Survey Committee, responses indicated that some questions were not clear. This resulted in the deletion of information reported on Item II.3.

To clarify headings on Tables I through V and information provided in Section VI, a copy of each section of the instrument can be found following each section's table. The responses found on these individual sections of the survey are compilations of all state responses. The responses for Guam and Puerto Rico with additional information on state responses are found in the "National Perspectives" dialogue.

I. STATE POLICIES AND PRACTICES

APD - As Previously Described
DL - Determined Locally
IB - Individual Basis

I. State Policy and Practices	1. State Legislation a mandate year b. discretionary (permissive) years	2. Included state definition a. General intellectual ability b. Specific academic aptitude c. Creative thinking abilities d. Advanced abilities in the fine and performing arts e. Leadership ability f. Psychomotor ability g. Psychosocial abilities h. Vocational i. Other	3. Identification of gifted/talented students requires/recommends Requires a. Teacher input b. Past products c. Student accomplishments d. Individual intelligence test scores e. Individual achievement test scores Recommends f. Achievement test scores g. Creativity tests h. Leadership abilities i. Visual and performing arts j. The LEA has full authority to determine k. Other	4. Does SDE have program standards	5. Does SDE have criteria or provision for recognizing quality programs	6. SDE recommends a specific curriculum	7. SDE requires a specific curriculum	8. Minimum amount of time spent with each student	9. Class size/caseload or pupil-teacher ratio requirements •determined locally Elementary Secondary (a) Self-contained classroom (b) Resource room (c) Itinerant teacher (d) Consulting program (e) Counseling program (f) Resource Center or special school (g) Cluster grouping (h) Other	10. (a) IEP or equivalent required (b) follow same policies and procedures as handicapped (c) have due process rights	11. SDE has ——— which allows acceleration. (a) a formal policy (b) an informal policy (c) no policy (d) a policy which restricts this action	12. Early enrollment in school	13. Receive high school credit prior to 9th grade	14. (a) Require preschool screening (b) Require preschool service
Alabama	'71 N	a,c	d,f,g,k (vision hearing, dis-advanaged	a,b,c,e	Y	Y	N	N	5 hrs. & IB	20-40 APD 20-40 APD 40-80 N/A No caseload	Y Y Y	c		N N	N N
Alaska	Y	a,b,c,d		a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i,k (LEA submits criteria for SEA approval)	N	Y	N	N	DL or IB	•	Y Y Y	c		Y Y	N Y
Arizona	'80	a,b,	K (97th percentile on one out of 17 state approved tests.)		N	N	N	N	DL or IB	•	N Y Y	c	Some allow	Y	N N
Arkansas	'87 N	a,c,i, (task commitment)		a,b,c,d,e,f,g,j,k (parent checklist & student interviews)	Y	Y	N	N	2.5 hrs.	a,d(K=20, Grades 1-3=23, Grades 4-6=25, Secondary=30 b. class=10-12, total 75)	N N Part-ial	b		N Y	N N
California	N Y	a,b,c,d,e,i (multidimentional)	more than one kind of information	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i	Y	Y	N	N	33.3 hrs.	•(selected from state options)	N N N	a		Y Y	N N
Colorado	Y	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h		j	N	N	N	N	DL or IB	•	N N N	c		N DL	N N
Connecticut	ID only 67-87	a,b,c,d		a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i	Y	N	N	N	DI or IB	•	N Y Y (for ID)	b		DL Y	N N
Delaware	All Y dist. have programs	a,b,c,d,e,f		a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i,j	Y	N	N	N	DL or IB	•	N N Not tested	c		Y DL	N N
Florida	'77	a	a(school personnel), d	a,c,f,h	N	N	Y	N	DL or IB	•(State recommended) E=15, S=18 12/period 12/period As needed E=15, S=18	Y Y Y	c,DL		N Y	N N
Georgia	'68	a	d (or group test) e (or group test) K (state approved)		Y	N	Y	Y	4.5 hrs.		N N Y	c		N N	N N
Hawaii	N N	a,b,c,d,e,f,g		a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i	N	N	Y	N	DL or IB		N N N	b		N N	N N
Idaho	'73	b		(3 out of 5) a,d,e or f, g,i	N	Y	N	N	DL or IB	•	Y Y Y	c		N N	N N
Illinois	N 63-87	a,b,c,d	a,b,c,f,g		Y	N	N	N	Recomm. 2.5 hrs. DL or IB	•	N N N	c		DL N	N N
Indiana	N 82-87	a,b,c,d,e		j	Y	Y	N	N	DL or IB	•	N N N	a		Y Y	N N

| | | |

APD - As Previously Described
DL - Determined Locally
IB - Individual Basis

I. State Policy and Practices	1 State Legislation a. mandate year b discretionary (permissive) years	2 Included state definition a General intellectual ability b Specific academic aptitude c Creative thinking abilities d Advanced abilities in the fine and performing arts e Leadership ability f Psychomotor ability g Psychosocial abilities h Vocational i Other	3 Identification of gifted/talented students requires/recommends Requires a Teacher input b Past products c Student accomplishments d Individual intelligence test scores e Individual achievement test scores f Achievement test scores g Creativity tests h Leadership abilities i Visual and performing arts j The LEA has full authority to determine k Other Recommends	4 Does SDE have program standards	5 Does SDE have criteria or provision for recognizing quality programs	6 SDE **recommends** a specific curriculum	7 SDE **requires** a specific curriculum	8 Minimum amount of time spent with each student	9 Class size/caseload or pupil-teacher ratio requirements *determined locally Elementary Secondary (a) Self-contained classroom (b) Resource room (c) Itinerant teacher (d) Consulting program (e) Counseling program (f) Resource Center or special school (g) Cluster grouping (h) Other	10 (a) IEP or equivalent required (b) follow same policies and procedures as handicapped (c) have due process rights	11 SDE has ____ which allows acceleration. (a) a formal policy (b) an informal policy (c) no policy (d) a policy which restricts this action	12 Early enrollment in school	13 Receive high school credit prior to 9th grade	14 (a) Require preschool screening (b) Require preschool service
North Dakota	N 60-65 70-87	i	a,c,d,f,g,h,i,k (psycho-motor & parent input)	Y	N	N	N DL or IB	•		N N (recommend)	b	Y in some cases	N N
Ohio	N 74-87	a,b,c,d	b,d,e,f,g,i (visual & performing arts)	Y	N	Y	Y 5 hrs.		20 20-60 20-60 not determined optional	N N N	c	Y N	N N
Oklahoma	81 prior to 81	a,b,c,d,e	d,f,h	a,b,c,e,g,h,i	N	N	Y	N DL or IB	•		N N N	a	N Y	N N
Oregon	N 79-87	a,b,c,d,e	a,d,c,d,e,f,g,h,i (depending on program)		Y	N	N	N DL or IB	•		N N Y	c	Y Y	N N
Pennsylvania	83	a,b,c,e	a,d,f	c,e,g,h	Y	N	N	Y DL or IB		10-18 10-20 15-75	Y Y Y	b	Y Y	N N
Rhode Island	N 79-87	a,b,c,d,i (visual, literary, or performing arts)	i	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,i,k (nominations by peer, parent, school psych., guid. counselor, principal, or self-aptitude tests)	Y	N	N	N DL or IB			N N Y	c	N Y	N N
South Carolina	Y	a,b,d,i (underachieving gifted)	a,c,d(or group),f	b	N	N	N	N G1-3=125 min G4-8=200 min G9-12=250 min	•	20 15 15 cluster > 15	N N N	c	N N	N N
South Dakota	76	a,b,i	j		Y	N	N	N DL or IB	•		Y Y Y	a	N N	N N
Tennessee	72 85-87	a,b(discretionary funds allows broader definition)	a,b,c,d,f		N	N	N	N DL or IB	•		Y Y Y	b	Y N	N Y
Texas	N 79-87	a,b,c,d,e,f	j(must use 5 criteria)	a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h	Y	Y	N	N 2.5 hrs.	•		N N N	a	N N	N N
Utah	N 80-87	a,b,c,d,e,g,h		a,d,e,g,j,k	N	N	N	N DL or IB	•		Y N N	c	N N	N N
Vermont	N N	i		k	N	N	N	N DL or IB	•		N N N	c	DL DL	N N

Virginia	Y	N	a.b.c.d.e.g.h		a.b.c.d.e.f.g.h.i (must be approved by SEA)	Y	Y	N	N	DL or IB	•				N	N	Y	a	N Y N N
Washington	N	84-87	a.b.c	d (indiv. & group), f.g (demonstrated through checklist or products).j		Y	N	N	N	DL or IB	•				Y	N	N	a	Y N N N
West Virginia	Y		a	a.d.e		Y		Y	N	DL or IB		12	30	30	Y	Y	Y	c	Y N N N
Wisconsin	1988	85-88	a.b.c.d.e	j	b.d.e.f.g.h.k (teacher, parent, peer, or self-nominations)	Y	N	N	N	DL or IB	•				N (recommend)	N	Y	b	Y in some cases N N
Wyoming	N	Y	a.b.c.d.e		a.d.e.f.g.h.i.j	N	Y	N	N	DL or IB	•				N	N	N	c	N DL N N
Guam	79		a.b.c.d.e.f	a.d.f.g(preschool only).h(teacher rating scale).j		N	N	N	N	3 hrs. (DL or IB)					N	N	Y	a	Y Y Y
Puerto Rico	Y		a.b.c.d.e.f.h	a.b.d.e.f	c.g	Y	Y	N	Y	DL or IB					Y	N	N	b	N N N N

Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted
State of the States Survey*

* Responses herein are a compilation of all states.

I. State Policies and Practices

1. Are there state legislations which

a. mandate services for the gifted/talented Yes 25 No 24
(if yes, in what year was the mandate implemented? _____)

b. support discretionary (permissive) programs for the gifted/talented
Yes 22 No ____
(in what years have you had discretionary programs? ____ - ____)

Are there special or unusual features of your state's legislation?

2. Please mark the areas that are included in your state definition of gifted/talented?

46 a. General intellectual ability

43 b. Specific academic apptitude

36 c. Creative thinking abilities

32 d. Advanced abilities in the fine and performing arts

22 e. Leadership ability

7 f. Psychomotor ability

6 g. Psychosocial abilities

5 h. Vocational

10 i. Other (please identify) _____

3. State Regulations/Guidelines for identification of gifted/talented students require/recommend information in which of the following areas:

Require	Recommend		Criteria (if applicable)
8	31	a. Teacher input (checklists)	
7	25	b. Past products	
7	29	c. Student accomplishments	

17	23	d.	Individual intelligence test scores
9	25	e.	Individual achievement test scores
14	25	f.	Achievement test scores
7	26	g.	Creativity tests
2	23	h.	Leadership abilities
4	23	i.	Visual and performing arts
7	16	j.	The LEA has full authority to determine what information to use in the identification of gifted/talented students.
5	8	k.	Other (please identify)

4. Does the State Department of Education have program standards which all state funded programs for the gifted/talented must adhere to?
   Yes 31 No 19

5. Does the State Department of Education have criteria or a provision for recognizing programs of utmost quality?
   Yes 13 No 36

6. Does the State Department of Education recommend a specific curriculum and/or course of study for gifted/talented programs?
   Yes 7 No 42

7. Does the State Department of Education require a specific curriculum and/or course of study for gifted/talented programs?
   Yes 4 No 45

8. What is the minimum amount of time facilitators for education of the gifted/talented are required to spend with each identified gifted/talented student on a weekly basis?
   2.1-5 hrs Minutes 37 This is a local determination or made on an individual basis.

9. The education of the gifted/talented class size/caseload requirement or pupil-teacher ratio for each of the following delivery models is:
(a) 34 determined locally by each LEA.
(b) _____ as follows for each category:

Elementary	Secondary	
10-40	_____	(1) Self-contained classroom (gifted/talented students are assigned to a special class but may receive some academic instruction in regular education classes. The teacher of the gifted/talented, however, is responsible for monitoring the student's progress in the regular education classroom.)
5-40	_____	(2) Resource room (gifted/talented students are enrolled in a regular education program, but go to a specially equipped classroom where they receive services with the consultant for the gifted/talented.)
5-65	_____	(3) Itinerant teacher (a teacher of the gifted/talented works with gifted/talented students possibly within the regular classroom on an individual basis and may pull the students out of the classroom to work on special projects on a one-on-one or small group basis.)
40-80	_____	(4) Consulting teacher model (services are provided to gifted/talented students through the regular education classroom with the facilitator for gifted/talented working with the regular education teacher to provide appropriate services.)
30-80	_____	(5) Counseling program (services are provided to students identified as gifted/talented through a counselor who works with social and/or higher education concerns.)
_____	_____	(6) Resource Center or special school (gifted/talented students attend a special school.)
_____	_____	(7) Cluster grouping (all regular education students are grouped according to ability; the brightest, therefore, receive services from the regular classroom teacher.)
_____	_____	(8) Other (please identify model.) _____

10. (a) Does the state require Individualized Educational Programs or the equivalent for students identified as gifted/talented?
Yes 15 No 34

(b) Are programs for the gifted/talented in your state required to follow the same policies and procedures as handicapped students within your state?
Yes 13 No 36

(c) Do gifted/talented students have due process right for identification and appropriate services?

Yes 23 No 24

11. Does the State Department of Education have a policy which allows acceleration of gifted/talented students by grade level and/or through individual content areas?

10 Yes - a formal policy
11 Yes - an informal policy
29 No policy exists
0 Our policies restrict this action

12. May students identified as gifted/talented enroll in school at an earlier age than other students of the same age?

Yes 18 No 25

13. Can gifted/talented students receive high school credit through Carnegie units prior to being in the 9th grade?

Yes 22 No 18

14. (a) Does your state require preschool screening for gifted/talented?

Yes 3 No ____

(b) Does your state require preschool services for gifted/talented?

Yes 3 No ____

NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE ON STATE POLICIES AND PRACTICES

1. Twenty-five states and Guam presently have mandated services for the education of the gifted/talented. Pennsylvania was the first state to require services for the gifted/talented in 1963. Twenty-four states do not have a mandate for services nor does Puerto Rico. Additionally, the state of Delaware does not have a mandate for services to gifted/talented students; however, Delaware has gifted programs in all districts within the state.

   Twenty-two states do not have a mandate but support discretionary (permissive) programs for the gifted/talented. This is also true in Puerto Rico. There is a total of 30 states which either presently have discretionary programs for the gifted/talented or have had discretionary programs in the past. Vermont, New Hampshire, and Hawaii do not have mandated services nor do they support discretionary programs for the gifted/talented.

2. The most common component of a state definition for gifted/talented was the component of general intellectual ability. Forty-six states, in addition to Guam and Puerto Rico, include this component in their definition. Nevada, North Dakota, Vermont, and Idaho are the only states which do not include general intellectual ability in their state's definitions. Forty-three states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, include specific academic aptitude in their state definition. Creative thinking abilities was identified in the definitions of 36 states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico. Thirty-two states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, included advanced abilities in the fine and performing arts in their state definition. Leadership ability was included in the state definitions of 22 states, in addition to Puerto Rico and Guam. Psychomotor ability was identified as a component of the state's definition in seven states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, while psychosocial abilities were included in the definitions of gifted/talented in six states. Vocational was identified in five states, plus Puerto Rico, as a component of the state definition.

3. Specific information is sometimes required or recommended for the identification of gifted/talented students within states. Eight states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, are required to have teacher input for identification while 31 states recommended teacher input. Seven states, plus Puerto Rico, reviewed past products in addition to 25 states which recommended the review of past products in the identification procedures of the gifted/talented. Seven states required and 29 states, plus Puerto Rico, recommended that student accomplishments should be considered in the identification procedure.

Individual intelligence test scores were required for identification by 17 states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, while these same test scores were recommended by 23 states. Individual achievement test scores were required by nine states, plus Puerto Rico, while 25 states recommended use of these test scores. Fourteen states, plus Puerto Rico and Guam, required an achievement test score or scores while 25 states recommended the use of these test scores. Seven states and Guam required creativity tests for the identification of the gifted/talented, while 26 states and Puerto Rico recommended their use. There were only two states, plus Guam, which required the review of leadership abilities, while 23 states recommended the review of leadership abilities in the identification process. Four states required consideration of visual and performing arts abilities while 23 states recommended a consideration of these abilities. Seven states, plus Guam, stated that the local education agency has full authority to determine what information would be used in the identification of gifted/talented students. Sixteen states recommended that the LEA have full authority to determine what information is used in the identification process. Five states required additional components in the identification process, including a minimum of three components, criteria to use standardized, nonstandardized, objective and subjective measures, requiring state approval and testing of critical thinking skills. Additional components which were recommended in eight states included teacher, peer, parent and self-nominations; psychomotor abilities testing; group IQ tests; aptitude tests; and student interviews.

4. Thirty-one states and Puerto Rico have State Department of Education program standards which all funded programs must adhere to. Nineteen states and Guam do not have these specific program standards which must be followed.

5. Thirteen states and Puerto Rico have criteria or a provision for recognizing programs of utmost quality. Thirty-six states and Guam have no such criteria nor provision.

6. Seven state departments of education recommend a specific curriculum or course of study for gifted/talented programs. Those states include Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Kentucky, Ohio, Oklahoma, and West Virginia. Forty-two states do not recommend a specific curriculum or course of study.

7. Pennsylvania, Ohio, Kentucky, and Georgia require a specific curriculum and/or course of study for gifted/talented programs. This is also true with Puerto Rico. However, 45 states and Guam have no such requirement.

8. The minimum amount of time facilitators for education of the gifted are required to spend with each identified gifted/talented student on a weekly basis varied from 2.1 to 5 hours per week. Thirty-seven states reported the determination on the amount of time spent with children was made on a local program or individual student basis.

9. In 34 states the class size/caseload requirements for gifted/talented programs are determined locally by each LEA. In addition, one state has specific options that the LEA may follow. The information collected furthermore indicates that at the elementary level the class size/caseload requirements for a self-contained classroom range from 10 to 40 students. The resource room requirements for both elementary and secondary range from five to 40 students. Itinerant teacher class size/caseload requirements range from five to 65 students per teacher. Requirements for the consulting teacher model allow for a class size/caseload from 40 to 80 students per teacher. The counseling program allowed a range from 30 to 80 students per teacher. Other requirements depended on whether a program was departmentalized, the specific grade level, and the number of students per period.

10. An individualized education program or its equivalent was required by 15 states, plus Puerto Rico. Thirty-four states and Guam have no such requirement. Thirteen states follow the same policies and procedures as those required for handicapped students in the state. Thirty-six states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, do not follow the same policies. Twenty-three states, plus Guam, allow gifted students to have due process rights for identification and appropriate services. In addition, one state has partial due process rights or due process for identification only and another state has not had a situation arise in which the due process rights have actually been tested. Twenty-four states and Puerto Rico do not allow students the right to a due process hearing for identification or for appropriate services.

11. Ten states and Guam have a formal policy which allows for the acceleration of students by grade level and/or individual content areas. Eleven states and Puerto Rico allow this procedure through an informal policy. Twenty-nine states do not have a policy on acceleration. However, no states reported that there were policies which restricted gifted students from being accelerated by grade level and/or through individual content areas.

12. Eighteen states, plus Guam, allow students identified as gifted to enroll in school at an age earlier than other students. In addition, seven states allow individual districts to make this decision. Twenty-five states and Puerto Rico do not allow students identified as gifted/talented to enroll

in school at an earlier age than other students of the same age.

13. Twenty-two states allow gifted/talented students to receive Carnegie units of credit prior to the ninth grade. In addition, eight states allow this based on the determination of the local school district. Eighteen states and Puerto Rico do not allow students to receive Carnegie unit credits prior to the ninth grade.

14. Louisiana, Missouri, and New York require preschool screening for gifted/talented students. This is also true with the state of Guam. Guam also requires preschool services for gifted/talented students. This is also true with the three states of Alaska, Louisiana, and Tennessee.

II. FUNDING

APD - As Previously Described
DL - Determined Locally
IB - Individual Basis

II. Funding for Fiscal Year 1987	1. State funds distributed to LEAs for G/T programs	2. 1st year of state funding for G/T	3. SDE funds used for state department directed/sponsored activities to G/T students	4. SDE funds provided for activities such as conferences, publications	5. Amount of federal funds used by LEA G/T program from state flow-through grants	6. Federal (SDE Administrative Discretionary) funds used toward funding G/T	7. a. Number of LEAs receiving state funds for G/T programs	b. Number of LEAs within state	8. Method for distribution of state funds a. funds provided through (1) general state education aid (2) categorical aid (3) special funding category for G/T (4) Other b. Procedure: (1) per pupil weight (2)formula (3) competitive grants (4) Other c. Funds distributed (1) Similarly to Special Education (2) Identically to Special Education (3) Based on FTE teaching units (4) Based on number of students served (5) ___% of the total program cost (6) Other			9. Additional state funds available for: a. Transportation b. Teacher training c. Private school tuition d. Evaluation of programs/pupils e. Pupil assessment f. Other	10. Local money reportedly spent on G/T programs
Alabama	DL	1971	$487,000 advanced placement	$180,000 pilot programs $898,000 school of fine arts	$161,490 Ch. II Block grants	Not available	104	129	State teacher units addl. allocation	DL after legislature allocates spec. ed. units		N Y N N N Y (advanced placement)	$442,500
Alaska	Not available	1972	-0-	-0-	Cannot be determined		51	55	2 (through Spec. Ed.)	2	2	Y	cannot be estimated
Arizona		1977	-0-	-0-	$271,103 Ch. II Block grants		224	224	4 umbrella programs)	1	4	N N N N N N	cannot be estimated
Arkansas	$5,907,547	1984	$1,071,000 (governor's school & other summer programs)	$5,000 All capital AGAT funds	$10,179 Ch. II Block grants	None	333	333	1	1	1	Y Y	cannot be estimated
California	$21,300,000	1962	-0-	15,000	500,000 Ch. II Migrant Ed., Title VII		428	1029	3	2	6		$6,000,000
Colorado	$200,000	1979	-0-	-0-			22	176	3	4 (invitational grants)	6 (short term pilots, no ongoing funding	N N N N N N	cannot be estimated
Connecticut	$4,500,000	1967		$13,000 (conferences & publications)	$40,000 (P.L. 94-142 handicapped G-T)		159	169	4 (state special ed. aid)	2 (30-70% reimbursement according to district wealth)	2	Y Y N Y Y	$4,500,000
Delaware	$1,700,000	1979	$10,000 (Olympics of Mind) & $108,000 (Gov. school)	-0-	$90,000 Ch. II Block grant	None	17	19	3	2	3	N N N N N N	cannot be estimated
Florida	$68,000,000	1977	-0-	As needed	cannot be determined		67	67	3	1	2,4	Y Y N Y Y	cannot be estimated
Georgia	$23,339,814	1968	-0-	-0-	$26,224 Ch. II	None	186	186	3	1	1 (All Ed. uses same formula)	N N N N N	cannot be estimated
Hawaii	$1,459,300	1977	$230,000 (summer res. programs)	$6,740 (inservice, mornitoring, T.A. & materials)	$59,272 Ch. II Block grants		7	7	3	2	6 (based on total enrollment)	N Y N Y Y	cannot be estimated

Idaho	$2,000,000	1974	-0-	$1,000 (inservice speakers)	Unknown	None	58	110	3	1.4 (80% reimbursement of personnel)	2	Y Y Y Y	cannot be estimated
Illinois	$9,039,100	1963	Not available	-0-	$183,108 Ch. II Block grants		846	992	3	2	6 (5% of average daily attendance)	Y	$15,327,062 (as reported by 57% of districts)
Indiana	$3,485,000	1980	$15,400 (Midwest Talent Search) $35,000 (Future Problem Solving)	$78,000 (workshop & summer opportunities guide) $42,000 (leadership accessing program)	$569,147 Ch. II Block grant	None	227	305	2,3	3,4 (planning grants available to any LEA)	4,6 (based on program level & committments)	N N N N N	$7,000,000
Iowa	-0- (funded locally) $7,744,000	N/A (funded locally)	-0-	-0-	$19,000 Ch. II	None	216	436	(State approval of gifted program allows for additional local tax (no distribution of state funds))			N N N N N	over $7,743,000
Kansas	$4,716,124	1953	-0-	-0-	$5,475 Ch. II Block grant & Equal Ed. Opportunity $5,400	None	96	96	2 (Sp. Ed.)	4 (equal proportion for all Spec. Ed. teachers)	2	Y Y N N N	$12,500,000
Kentucky	$6,100,100	1982	$100,000 (Humanities Inst. & Scholar's program)	$20,000 (Coordinators, Conf. & Assoc. for Gifted, & Publications)	Not available	Not available	178	178	3	2	4	N N N N N	$2,800,000
Louisiana	100% of state appropriation	1977	None	$5,000 (Conferences)	None	None	64	66	3	1		N N N Y Y Y (salary of gifted teachers)	cannot be estimated
Maine	$1,271,612	1982	25,000 (Summer Residential Programs)	248,000 (training, publications, information dissemination, conferences, institutions, competitive grants, travel, etc.)	43,000 Ch. II Endorsement for Arts	25,000 Ch. II Endorsement for Arts	90	181	1,2,3	2,3	2,5 (averages 60% of costs)	Y Y N Y Y	cannot be estimated
Maryland	-0-	N/A	$610,000	$60,000 (innovative projects, conferences, publications, & meetings)	$595,991 Ch. II Block grant	None	None	24	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$13,830,000
Massachusetts	$900,000	1986	$10,000 (leadership training)	$100,000 (publications, seminars, workshops)	$50,000 Block grants		100	385	1,3	2,3	4	Y	cannot be estimated
Michigan	$5,981,000	1984	$250,000 (summer institute)	-0-	$470,523 Ch. II Block grants $10,000 Voc. Ed. 98-524	No specific amount but requests accepted & reviewed	539	567	2	2	6 (formula based on general education membership)	Y Y N Y Y Y (teacher salaries)	cannot be estimated

APD - As Previously Described
DL - Determined Locally
IB - Individual Basis

II. Funding for Fiscal Year 1987	1. State funds distributed to LEAs for G/T programs	2. 1st year of state funding for G/T	3. SDE funds used for state department directed/sponsored activities to G/T students	4. SDE funds provided for activities such as conferences, publications	5. Amount of federal funds used by LEA G/T program from state flow-through grants	6. Federal (SDE Administrative Discretionary) funds used toward funding G/T	7. a. Number of LEAs receiving state funds for G/T programs	b. Number of LEAs within state	8. Method for distribution of state funds a. funds provided through (1) general state education aid (2) categorical aid (3) special funding category for G/T (4) Other	b. Procedure: (1) per pupil weight (2) formula (3) competitive grants (4) Other	c. Funds distributed (1) Similarly to Special Education (2) Identically to Special Education (3) Based on FTE teaching units (4) Based on number of students served (5) ____% of the total program cost (6) Other	9. Additional state funds available for: a. Transportation b. Teacher training c. Private school tuition d. Evaluation of programs/pupils e. Pupil assessment f. Other	10. Local money reportedly spent on G/T programs
Minnesota	$1,370,780	1979	-0-	$3,750 (travel & teacher training publications, conferences)	$15,800 (Title II Economic Security Demonstration/ Exemplary projects, in math, science & Foreign Lang.)	None	422	434	2	2	4 (up to 5% of avg. daily membership)	Y Y N N N Y (college tution H.S students)	$3,000,000
Mississippi	$8,792,672	1975	-0-	-0-	$46,302 (Ch. II part c)	None	128	154	1	4 (teacher units based on eligible students being served)	4	N N N N N N	cannot be estimated
Missouri	$5,000,000	1974	$345,000 (Scholar's Academy)	$15,000 (St. conferences, new teacher workshop, Future Problem Solving Program, publications)	$100,000 (Ch. II)	$43,000 (Teacher Academy)	200	545	1	4 (non-competitive grant, 50% of salary & instructional materials)	5 (50%)	Y N N Y Y	$5,000,000
Montana	$95,000			$1,000 (publications)	$8,000 (math/science) $68,043 (Ch. II)	None	48	550	3	3	6 (competitive grant)		cannot be estimated
Nebraska	$450,000	1967	-0-				40	960	4 (equalization gen. state aid, & percent over & above)	1,2	4 (10% of total school population	N N N N N	cannot be estimated
Nevada	$1,623,450	1973	$12,000 (Summer residential programs)	-0-	-0-	None	9	17	1	4 (unit funding)	2	N N N N Y	cannot be estimated
New Hampshire	$600,000			$135,000 (teacher training) $9,500 (gifted library at SDE) $2,000 (state survey) $4,000 (revision of state guidelines)	Ch. II	None			4 (governor's initiatives for excellence in education)	3	6 (criteria varies in grant categories)	Y	cannot be estimated

New Jersey	$200,000			$10,000 (state forum & regional workshops)			15	4 (competitive grants)	3	6 (no grant to exceed $20,000)	N N N N N N	cannot be estimated
New Mexico		1972	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	88	1	2	6	N N N N N N	cannot be estimated
New York	$13,300,000	1981	$267,000 (6 summer residential programs in visual & performing arts)	$10,000 (travel, publications, consultants and advisory council)	not available	None	437 740	1	2	6 ($192 x 3% average daily attendance)	Y Y N N Y	$50,000,000
North Carolina	$17,000,000	1959	$785,000 (governor's schools)	$10,000 (summer institutes & publications)	not available	not available	140 140	4 (non-categorical state aid for exceptional children)	1,2	1	Y Y N Y Y	$2,000,000
North Dakota	$168,243	1951			$34,481		15 33	2	4 perqualified teacher)	2,3	N N N N N	cannot be estimated
Ohio	$11,900,000	1975	$500,000 (Governor's school) $40,000 (Essex School for the Gifted)	Not available	$500,000	None	350 615	3	2	2	N Y N Y Y	cannot be estimated
Oklahoma	Based on on Child Count	1981	-0-	State meeting, curriculum guide, inservice and workshops	$135,718	None	613 613	3	1,2	4	N N N N N	cannot be estimated
Oregon	$336,375	1979	(Future Problem Solving Bowl & college summer program)	Directory, conferences/ inservice speakers, newsletter & ed. activities	$114,268 Ch. II	None	21 305	2	3	5 (50% or less)	Y N N N	$4,630,190
Pennsylvania	$23,000,000	1963	(Part of Governor's school)	as needed for publications	$130,000 yearly P.L 98-377 Title II	$5,000	29 ID's +350 SD 29 ID's +501 SD	2	4 (100% excess cost)	1	Y N N Y Y	cannot be estimated
Rhode Island	$502,500	1982			$160,000 Ch. II	None	40 40	3	4 (allocations)	6 (10% of previous year enrollment)	N Y N N N	$1,500,000 30 out of 35 LEAs reporting
South Carolina	$15,000,000	1980	-0-	Conference, printing, consultant travel	$46,142 Ch. II 85-86		91 91	3	1	4	Y Y	
South Dakota	$2,034,621	1976	$50,000 (discretionary projects)				194 194	2 (Sp. Ed.)	4 (50% for allowable costs)	2.5 (50%)	N Y N Y Y	cannot be estimated
Tennessee	$5,800,000	1972	$1,150,000 (Summer Residential Programs)	$150,000 (teacher training, curriculum development, publications, task forces)	Ch. II $244,002	$7,000	123 141	4	2	2		cannot be estimated
Texas	$6,598,000	1985	$412,000 (Future Problem Solving, Olympics of the Minds, Governor's school)	$80,000 (Basic training conferences & publications)	$1,600,000 Ch. II		447 1074	3	1	4 (5% limit of daily attendance)	Foundation funds may be used for anything except construction or private school tuition	cannot be estimated

APD - As Previously Described
DL - Determined Locally
IB - Individual Basis

II. Funding for Fiscal Year 1987	1. State funds distributed to LEAs for G/T programs	2. 1st year of state funding for G/T	3. SDE funds used for state department directed/sponsored activities to G/T students	4. SDE funds provided for activities such as conferences, publications	5. Amount of federal funds used by LEA G/T program from state flow-through grants	6. Federal (SDE Administrative Discretionary) funds used toward funding G/T	7 a. Number of LEAs receiving state funds for G/T programs	b. Number of LEAs within state	8. Method for distribution of state funds a. funds provided through (1) general state education aid (2) categorical aid (3) special funding category for G/T (4) Other	b. Procedure (1) per pupil weight (2)formula (3) competitive grants (4) Other	c. Funds distributed (1) Similarly to Special Education (2) Identically to Special Education (3) Based on FTE teaching units (4) Based on number of students served (5) ___% of the total program cost (6) Other	9. Additional state funds available for a. Transportation b. Teacher training c. Private school tuition d. Evaluation of programs/pupils e. Pupil assessment f. Other	10. Local money reportedly spent on G/T programs
Utah	$875,000	1980	None (College & Univ. co-sponsor programs)	$5,000	Used by 9 districts	None	40	40	3 (1 to begin 87-88)	1	6 (based on student enrollment)	N N N N N N	cannot be estimated
Vermont	-0-		$30,000 (governor's institutes)	Less than $1,000	$120,000 Ch. II		0	249	No funds provided			No funds provided	cannot be estimated
Virginia	$11,488,193	1974	$2,090,300 (Governor's school programs)	$1,000 (Conf. for gifted program admins. & project TA for gifted)	Unknown	$100,000 (Ch. II Block grants-competitive)	140	140	3,4 (LEAs share of gifted)	2	3	Y Y N Y Y	$20,000,000
Washington	$2,520,000	1984	$20,000 (State honors awards program)	$5,400 (newsletter, directory, end-of-year report, curr. models, survey summary report conf. speakers)	$190,843 Ch. II	$11,000 Title II Science funds)	265	298	3	2	6 (1% of total population x $336)	Y Y N Y Y Y (auxillary services to private school students)	$6,200,000
West Virginia							55	55	2	1	2.3		cannot be estimated
Wisconsin	State-Aid is not categorical	1985	$25,000	$3,747	Unknown	Ch. II $25,000	432	432	1	1.2	4.5 (42.7%)	Y Y N Y Y	cannot be estimated
Wyoming	$405,279	1981	None			$10,000-$15,000	30	49	3		4	Y N N N Y	$405,279
Puerto Rico	$542,445	1974			$2,789 Ch. II	None			3	3	5	Y Y N Y Y	State funds
Guam	$413,456	1979	None	None	Ch. II $123,814	$123,814	Statewide		3	4	3	N Y N N N N	State & local are combined

Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted
State of the States Survey*

* Responses herein are a compilation of all states.

II. Funding for Fiscal Year 1987 (Since this fiscal year may not be complete, estimated dollar amounts may be used.)

1. What amount of state funds are distributed to LEAs for implementing programs for gifted/talented students? _____

2. In what year was state funding for gifted/talented first made available to all LEAs within your state? _____

3. What is the total amount of state funds which are provided to LEAs during the current fiscal year? _____

4. What amount of state department funds are used for state department directed/sponsored activities to gifted/talented students, such as summer residential programs? (Please identify the types of activities included herein.)

5. What amount of state (department) funds are provided for state department sponsored/directed activities for the gifted/talented such as conferences, publications, etc.? (Please identify the types of activities included herein.)

6. What amount of federal funds are used by LEA gifted/talented programs as a result of state flow-through grants such as Chapter 2 block grants, Indian education, vocational education acts, etc.? (Please identify the types of federal grants and the total amount used by gifted/talented from each source.)

7. From federal funds (e.g. block grants, Indian education, vocational education acts, etc.), how much of the State Department of Education Administration Discretionary Funds are used toward funding education of the gifted/talented?

8. a. How many LEAs within your state receive state funds for education of the gifted/talented? _____

   b. How many LEAs are there within your state? _____

9. What is the method for the distribution of gifted/talented state funds?

a. Funds are provided through

9 (1) general state education aid

11 (2) categorical aid

23 (3) special funding category for gifted/talented

7 (4) other (please explain)

b. Please identify procedure:

14 per pupil weight

21 formula

7 competitive grants

11 Other determination of funds (please explain)

c. Funds are distributed:

4 (1) Similarly to the Special Education funding formula

12 (2) Identically to the Special Education formula

4 (3) Based on FTE teaching units

13 (4) Based on number of students served

5 (5) ___% of the total program cost

14 (6) Other (please describe)

10. General state funds are available in addition to state targeted dollars for gifted/talented in the following areas:

	Yes	No
a. Transportation	19	
b. Teacher training	20	
c. Private school tuition	0	
d. Evaluation of programs/pupils	16	
e. Pupil assessment	19	
f. Other (please identify)	5	

11. In addition to state dollars provided for education of the gifted/talented, how much local money is reportedly spent on gifted/talented programs? $405,279 - 50,000,000

31 This amount cannot be estimated.

36

NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE ON FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEAR 1987

1. Since not all states could identify the amount of state funds distributed to LEAs for implementing programs for the gifted and talented and, since due to the varying numbers of identified students by state, data on this item cannot be compared between states or given an appropriate overview through a total. However, this information is provided on Table II. Funding for Fiscal Year 1987.

2. North Dakota was the first state to provide funding for gifted/talented programs. This occurred in 1951.

3. Although information was requested on the total amount of state funds provided to LEAs during the current fiscal year, responses were varied and misleading. Possibly, since this questionnaire related to education of the gifted, it was perceived that this question was interpreted to mean identify the amount of funds provided for education of the gifted programs. The intent was to identify, through comparing question number three to question number one, the percentage of state dollars which was provided for education of the gifted programs. However, as stated, due to the variety of answers which typically included the same response as to item number one, this data was very misleading and, therefore, is not reported herein.

4. Eighteen states and Guam reported that there were no state department of education funds used for state department directed/sponsored activities to gifted/talented students. Other states provided between $10,000 and $1,150,000 for state department directed/sponsored activities. These activities included such things as advanced placement programs, summer residential programs or governor's schools, Olympics of the Mind competition, institutes, specific training, Future Problem Solving activities, discretionary projects, and honors awards programs.

5. Between $1,000 and $248,000 were provided through state department funds for gifted/talented activities as pilot programs, conferences, publications, inservice, monitoring, materials, summer opportunities guide, innovative projects, teacher training, Future Problem Solving, a state library of resources for the gifted on the gifted, revising state guidelines, regional workshops, consultants, advisory councils, curriculum guides, newsletters, travel, university and college co-sponsored activities and state directories. Twelve states and Guam, however, did not identify any specific funds from the state department for activities as described herein.

6. Although three states did not identify the use of specific federal flow-through funds which were used to support gifted/talented programs, most states listed specific grants which were used to support gifted/talented programs. These flow-through funds were obtained through the following: Chapter 2 Block Grant, Migrant Education, Title VII, 94-142 Handicapped, Equal Education Opportunity, Endowment for the Arts, Vocational Education, P.L. 98-524, Math/Science, and P.L. 98-377. Maryland used $595,991 from the Chapter 2 Block Grant Program to support education of the gifted/talented.

7. Federal funds which came specifically from administration discretionary funds and which were used to support programs for the gifted included funding from science funds, Title II, Chapter 2 Block Grant, and the Endowment for the Arts. Virginia used $100,000 of their administration discretionary funds to provide support for education of the gifted/talented. Twenty states and Puerto Rico stated that they did not use administration discretionary funds for gifted programs within their state.

8. In order to give an indication of the proportion of programs within a state which receive state funding, a percentage has been identified by comparing the total number of LEAs within a state to the number of LEAs within a state which receive state funds for education of the gifted/talented. These percentages are listed below.

Alabama	80.6%
Alaska	92.7%
Arizona	100%
Arkansas	100%
California	41.6%
Colorado	12.5%
Connecticut	94.1%
Delaware	89.5%
Florida	100%
Georgia	100%
Hawaii	100%
Idaho	50%
Illinois	85.3%
Indiana	74.4%
Iowa	49.5%
Kansas	100%
Kentucky	100%
Louisiana	97%
Maine	49.7%
Massachusetts	26%
Michigan	95.1%
Minnesota	97.2%
Mississippi	83.1%

Missouri	36.7%
Montana	8.7%
Nebraska	4.2%
Nevada	52.9%
New York	99.6%
North Carolina	100%
North Dakota	45.5%
Ohio	56.9%
Oklahoma	100%
Oregon	6.9%
Pennsylvania	100% IU's 69.9% SD's
Rhode Island	100%
South Carolina	100%
South Dakota	100%
Tennessee	87.2%
Texas	41.6%
Utah	100%
Virginia	100%
Washington	88.9%
West Virginia	100%
Wisconsin	100%
Wyoming	61%

9. Nine states identified funding for education of the gifted as being received through general state education aid. Eleven states noted that funds were provided through categorical aid. Twenty-three states, plus Puerto Rico and Guam, stated that there was a special funding category for gifted/talented. Seven states noted other procedures through which funds were provided to gifted/talented programs.

   The amount of funding was determined by 14 states through a per pupil weight. Twenty-one states determined the amount to be funded through a specific formula. Seven states and Puerto Rico provided funding through competitive grants. Eleven states and Guam had other procedures for determining the amount of funds to be provided to a program.

   Four states disseminated funds similarly to a state special education funding formula. Twelve states provided funding for gifted/talented programs in an identical fashion to the special education formula. Four states and Guam distributed funds based on a full-time equivalency teaching unit. Thirteen states provided funding according to the number of students served in a program. Five states and Puerto Rico provided funding to programs through a percentage of the total program cost. These percentages varied from "up to 50%" to 60% of the total program cost. Fourteen states used a wide variety of other practices for determining the amount of funds to be distributed to programs.

10. In many cases funds are provided in addition to the state targeted dollars for gifted/talented programs. Examples of this are as follows: Nineteen states, plus Puerto Rico, identified additional funding for transportation. Twenty states, plus Puerto Rico and Guam, stated that additional dollars were provided for teacher training. Sixteen states, plus Puerto Rico, stated that in addition to dollars earmarked for gifted/talented programs, money was provided for evaluation of programs/pupils. Nineteen states plus Puerto Rico stated that additional funds were made available for pupil assessments. "Other" was identified by five states. This represented funding for Advanced Placement, teacher salaries, and college training for high school students.

11. Thirty-one states stated that they could not estimate the amount of money provided for education of the gifted/talented from a local basis. From the remaining 29 states, the amount of local monetary support for education of the gifted/talented ranged from $405,279 up to $50 million in individual states.

III. STATE SUPPORT SERVICES

41

III. State Support Services	1. State has recognized G/T education through a. legislation b. public endorsement or proclamation by governor c. public endorsement by chief state school officer d. funding e. assignment of staff in G/T leadership positions f. policy or position statement by State BOE supporting G/T g. Other	2. SDE specialist facilitates advocacy through a. communication with state legislators b. contacts with U.S. congressmen and senators c. contacts with businessmen d. coordinated efforts with professional education association e. Involving personnel and/or subject matter/curriculum from other categorical programs f. Involving institutions of higher education g. Involving regional and statewide G/T groups and associations h. Involvement of parents	3. State guidelines/approval criteria available	4. Written materials available a. flyers b. guidelines c. directory of gifted/talented programs d. descriptions of local gifted/talented programs e. others	5. SDE evaluate each G/T program How often?	6. SDE monitor local G/T programs criteria for state approval a. Identification b. Program standards c. Program facilities d. Expenditure of funds e. Other	7. SDE completed formal statewide evaluation	8. Local programs required to evaluate own programs How often?	9. a. SDE certification requirements b. If no, what required c. Certification requirements based on (1) number of graduate hours (2) competencies (3) inservice hours (4) attendance at conferences (5) Other	10. a. State advisory committee or study commission for G/T b. If yes, size and purpose	11. Where specialist(s) for G/T located	12. State first developed position for G/T coordinator	13. SDE sponsored inservice training for: a. teachers of the gifted b. regular education teachers c. administrators d. support staff e. others
Alabama	a,d,e,(1.0),f,g(dual enrollment in post-secondary institutions)	N N N Y Y Y Y Y Y	N Y	N N Y (resource manual)	N	a,b,c,d,e(monitoring every 3 yrs. spec. ed. compliance)	N	N	Y 1,2,5 (competency tests)	N	Student instructional services program for exceptional children & youth	1976	a,b,c,d
Alaska	a,d,e,(.15), g(criteria for excellence for G/T programs)	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y	Y	Y Y (regulations)	N	e (regulations)	N	N	Y 5(completion of approved univ. program)	N	Office for Special Services	1978	a,b,c
Arizona	a,b,e(1.0)	N N N Y Y Y Y Y	Y	Y	N	None	N	N	Y 1,2,3,4,5 (experience & practicum)	Y 25 make recommendations	School Improvement Unit	1986	a,b,c,e(parents)
Arkansas	a,b,c,d,e,(3 FTE),f	N N N Y Y Y Y Y Y	Y	Y	N	b(includes identification),d	N	Y Annually	N (pending approval 18 graduate hours)	Y 9 consider problems, determine need select outstanding programs & make annual report	Special Education	1980	a,b,c,d
California	a,c,d,e(3 FTE),f	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y	Y	Y Y Y Y Y (Books)	Y Every 3 yrs.	a,b,c,d,e (teacher competencies & needs based staff develop)	Y	Y Annually	N (staff development)	N	Instructional Support Services Division, Gifted & Talented Ed. Unit	1962	a,b,c
Colorado	a,c,d,e(1.5 FTE),f	N N Y Y Y Y Y Y Y	Y	N Y Y	N	e(state accreditation standards)	N	Y Every 5 yrs.	N (change to be effective 1990)	Y 16	Curriculum & Instruction Unit	1966	a,b,c
Connecticut	a,d,e,(2.0 FTE),f	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y	Y	Y Y Y Y (descriptive booklets on specific topics)	N	a,b,c,d	N	Y Annually	N (future regulations will require number of graduate hrs.)	Y 30 provide information on critical issues	Bureau of Special Education	1966	a,b,c,d,e(parents)
Delaware	a,e(1.0 FTE)	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y	Y	Y Y Y	Y Every 5 yrs.	b	N	N	Y 1,5 (2 years teaching exp.)	Y 34 share information and advice	Special Education	1986	a,b,c
Florida	a,d,e(1.0 FTE),f	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y	Y	Y	Y Every 3 yrs.	a,b,c,d	N	Y	Y 1,3	Y 14	Special Education	1973	a,b,c,d,e (parents)

| | | |

III. State Support Services	1. State has recognized G/T education through a. legislation b. public endorsement or proclamation by governor c. public endorsement by chief state school officer d. funding e. assignment of staff in G/T leadership positions f. policy or position statement by State BOE supporting G/T g. Other	2. SDE specialist facilitates advocacy through a. communication with state legislators b. contacts with U.S. congressmen and senators c. contacts with businessmen d. coordinated efforts with professional education association e. involving personnel and/or subject matter/curriculum from other categorical programs f. involving institutions of higher education g. involving regional and statewide G/T groups and associations h. involvement of parents	3. State guidelines/approval criteria available	4. Written materials available a. flyers b. guidelines c. directory of gifted/talented programs d. descriptions of local gifted/talented programs e. others	5. SDE evaluate each G/T program How often?	6. SDE monitor local G/T programs criteria for a. identification b. Program standards c. Program facilities d. Expenditure of funds e. Other	7. SDE completed formal statewide evaluation	8. Local programs required to evaluate own programs How often?	9. a. SDE certification requirements b. If no, what required c. Certification requirements based on (1) number of graduate hours (2) competencies (3) inservice hours (4) attendance at conferences (5) Other	10. a. State advisory committee or study commission for G/T b. If yes, size and purpose	11. Where specialist(s) for G/T located	12. State first developed position for G/T coordinator	13. SDE sponsored inservice training for: a. teachers of the gifted b. regular education teachers c. administrators d. support staff e. others
Mississippi	a,c,d,e,(.3 FTE)g (appointment of state activities committee)	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y Y N			N	a,b,d	N	Y as specified in local plan	Y 1,2,3	Y 18 advise State Board on issues/concerns	Bureau of Special Services	1975	No
Missouri	a,d,e,(2 FTE),f	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y			Y Every 3 yrs.	a,b,c,d,e (pupil teacher ratio curriculum)	N	Y Annually	N teaching certificate at grade level	N	Division of Instruction	1974	a,b,c,d,e
Montana	a,c,d,e,f	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y N Y Y Y Y		legislation bibliographies & ins. training manual)	N	e (competitive grant objectives)	N	N	N none specific	N	Educational Services	1979	a,b,c,d,e (business consortium community service clubs, parent, and university personnel)
Nebraska	a,d,e(.5 FTE)	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y			Y On paper twice a yr.	a,b	Y	Y Annually	Y 2	Y 18 advise state board	Curriculum	Early 70's	a,b,c,d
Nevada	a,b,c,d	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y		(parent advisory list)	N	No	N	N	Y Elem. Sec. or Spec. Ed.	N	Special Education	1971	None
New Hampshire	b,d,e(1 FTE),f,g (G/T policies & procedures)	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y		Presently being updated	b,c,e,d in process	N	e (focus on enhancement of programs)	N N	N in process	Y identify priorities for funding	Division of Spec. Services future to Division of Instruction	1983	a,b,c,d,e (School Board members & interested community members)
New Jersey	a,e,(1.4)	Y N N Y Y Y Y N N Y Y Y		state survey	Y Every 3 yrs.	No	N	N	N determined by LEA	Y 17 advise commissioner & assist consultant	General Academic Education	1970	No
New Mexico	a,d,e(1.0 FTE)	N N N N N Y Y Y Y Y			Y 3 yr. cycle			N	Y 2	N	Special Education	Not a specific position	
New York	a,d,e,(1 FTE),f	N N Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y			N	No	N	N	N teacher certification	Y 18	Division for Program Development	mid 1950's	a,b,c,d

| | | |

III. State Support Services	1. State has recognized G/T education through a. legislation b. public endorsement or proclamation by governor c. public endorsement by chief state school officer d. funding e. assignment of staff in G/T leadership positions f. policy or position statement by State BOE supporting G/T g. Other	2. SDE specialist facilitates advocacy through a. communication with state legislators b. contacts with U.S. congressmen and senators c. contacts with businessmen d. coordinated efforts with professional education association e. involving personnel and/or subject matter/curriculum from other categorical programs f. involving institutions of higher education g. involving regional and statewide G/T groups and associations h. involvement of parents	3. State guidelines/approval criteria available	4. Written materials available a. flyers b. guidelines c. directory of gifted/talented programs d. descriptions of local gifted/talented programs e. others	5. SDE evaluate each G/T program How often?	6. SDE monitor local G/T programs criteria for state approval a. Identification b. Program standards c. Program facilities d. Expenditure of funds e. Other	7. SDE completed formal statewide evaluation	8. Local programs required to evaluate own programs How often?	9. a. SDE certification requirements b. If no, what required c. Certification requirements based on (1) number of graduate hours (2) competencies (3) inservice hours (4) attendance at conferences (5) Other	10. a. State advisory committee or study commission for G/T b. If yes, size and purpose	11. Where specialist(s) for G/T located	12. State first developed position for G/T coordinator	13. SDE sponsored inservice training for: a. teachers of the gifted b. regular education teachers c. administrators d. support staff e. others
Virginia	a,b,c,d,e(2 FTE),f	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y	Y	Y Y Y (local plans)	Y Annual plan review, every 5 yrs. admin. review	a,d,e	N	Y 5 yrs.	N local training for staff	Y 25 advice CSSO & St. Board & assess progress	Division for Humanities and Sec. Admin.	1973	a,b,c,d,e(guidance counselors & governor's school admin. & faculty
Washington	a,d,e(1.0 FTE)	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y	Y	Y Y Y	Y By district request	b	1984	N	N reg. teacher certification	Y 15 advise SEA	Support Services	1974	a,b,c,d,e(parents)
West Virginia	a,d,e(1.0 FTE),f	N N Y Y Y Y Y Y Y	Y	Y Y (Comprehensive report on gifted	N	Yes	N		Y 1,2	N	Special Education	1979	a,b,c,e(parents)
Wisconsin	a,c,d,e(1.0 FTE)	Y N Y Y Y Y Y Y Y	Y	Y Y Y (Resource & Planning Guide)	Y Every 5 yrs. beginning 1988	a,e.	N	N	N None	N	School Improvement	1976	
Wyoming	a,d,e(.5 FTE),f	N N N Y Y Y Y Y Y	Y	Y Y Y	Y Every 3 yrs. thru accred.	No	N	N	N None 1986 teachers must take one course	N	Curr. & Instruction	Early 70's	a,b,c,d
Puerto Rico	a,d	N N N N Y Y Y Y	Y	Y Y Y Y Y	Y Annually	a,b,c,d	Y	Y Annually	Y 1,2,3,4,5 (workshops)	Y 10 planning follow-up, & evaluation	Spec. Ed. & Ed. of Gifted		a,b,c,d,e(parents)
Guam	a,b,c,d,e(3 FTE)	Y N Y Y Y Y Y Y Y	Y	Y Y Y Y Y	Y Annually	No	Y	Y Annually	N 2 weeks of training each school year	N	Special Eduction	1977	a,b,c,d,e(parents)

Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted
State of the States Survey*

* Responses herein are a compilation of all states.

III. State Support Services

1. The State Department of Education and the state has recognized gifted and talented education through:

47 a. legislation.

13 b. a public endorsement or proclamation by the governor.

18 c. a public endorsement by the chief state school officer.

45 d. funding.

47 e. The assignment of staff in gifted and talented leadership positions.

(There are 0-4 FTE positions working with the State Department of Education assigned specifically to the area of gifted/talented.)

29 f. A policy or position statement by the State Board of Education supporting gifted/talented.

8 g. Other (Please explain.)

2. The State Department of Education specialist for education of the gifted/talented facilitates state, national, and international advocacy through:

yes	no	
32	17	a. personal contacts, position papers, and/or correspondence with state legislators.
23	20	b. contacts with U.S. congressmen and senators.
29	14	c. contacts with businessmen.
46	2	d. coordinated efforts with professional education associations.
43	2	e. Involving State Department of Education and/or LEA personnel from other categorical programs and/or the specific subject matter/curriculum disciplines.
48	1	f. Involving institutions of higher education.
47	1	g. Involving regional and statewide groups and associations of educators of gifted and talented children.
45	2	h. Involvement of parents, parent groups, and associations.

3. Does the State Department of Education have available, upon request, state guidelines/approval criteria for education of the gifted programs?

Yes 41 No 7

4. What State Department of Education written materials are available on types of gifted/talented programs, practices and procedures in your state?

	Yes	No
a. flyers	16	
b. guidelines	43	
c. directory of gifted/ talented programs	32	
d. descriptions of local gifted/talented programs	29	
e. others (please list)	16	

5. Does the State Department of Education evaluate each local gifted/ talented program? Yes 27 No

If yes, how often? 1-5 years

6. Does the State Department of Education monitor local gifted/talented programs? Yes 3 No 9

If yes, what is the criteria for state approval?

a. Identification 25

b. Program standards 28

c. Program facilities 12

d. Expenditure of funds 24

e. Other 13

7. Has the State Department of Education completed a formal statewide evaluation of gifted/talented programs in your state?
Yes 14 No 35

8. Are local gifted/talented programs required to evaluate their own programs? Yes 25 No 23

If yes, how often? 1-5 years

9. a. Does the State Department of Education require teachers to meet certification requirements to work with the gifted/talented program? Yes 19 No 31

b. If no, what training is required for teachers of the gifted/talented?

c. If yes, are certification requirements based on:

	Yes	No
(1) number of graduate hours	13	
(2) competencies	8	
(3) inservice hours	3	
(4) attendance at conferences	1	
(5) other (please explain)	6	

10. a. Does the State Department of Education have an advisory committee or study commission for education of the gifted? Yes 28 No 22

b. If yes, what is the committee/commission size and purpose?

11. In what section (example: Special Education, Educational Assistance, Education of Gifted, etc.) is the specialist(s) for gifted and talented presently located? _____

18 Special Education 4 Curriculum & Instruction 2 Instruction
5 Curriculum 3 Special Services 2 School Improvement

12. In what year did your state first develop a position for a gifted/talented coordinator? Mid 1950's - Present

13. Does the State Department of Education sponsor inservice training on education of the gifted/talented for:

40 a. teachers of the gifted
37 b. regular education teachers
38 c. administrators
23 d. support staff
16 e. others (please identify)

NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE ON STATE SUPPORT SERVICES

1. Individual states and state departments of education have recognized gifted and talented education through a variety of practices. Forty-seven states, plus Puerto Rico and Guam, have recognized gifted and talented education through specific legislation. Thirteen states and Guam have recognized gifted and talented education through a public endorsement or proclamation by the governor. Eighteen states and Guam have had a public endorsement of gifted and talented education by the Chief State School Officer. Forty-five states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, have seen recognition of gifted and talented education through program funding. Forty-seven states have provided recognition to gifted and talented education through the assignment of staff in leadership positions. Throughout the United States these leadership positions range from 0 to 4.0 FTE. The state of Oklahoma has four staff positions providing leadership in education of the gifted. California, Indiana, Arkansas, Georgia, and Guam each have three staff members in leadership positions. Additionally, there are nine states which have 2.0 FTE staff in gifted and talented leadership positions. Twenty-nine states have a policy or position statement from the State Board of Education supporting gifted/talented education. Eight states have other procedures to support gifted/talented education which include dual enrollment at postsecondary schools, criteria for gifted/talented program excellence, special reports, waivers, state advisory committees, policies and procedures, and legislative resolutions.

2. The specialists for education of the gifted at state departments of education continually provide advocacy for gifted/talented education. Thirty-two states, plus Guam, provide advocacy through personal contacts, position papers, and/or correspondence with state legislators. Twenty-three state specialists make contacts with U.S. congressmen and senators. Twenty-nine states and Guam have their state specialists make contact with businessmen for support. Forty-six states and Guam work through their state specialist for education of the gifted in coordinating efforts with professional education associations. Forty-three states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, involve state department of education and/or LEA personnel from other categorical programs and/or specific subject matter/curriculum disciplines. Forty-eight states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, encourage advocacy through the involvement of institutions of higher education. Forty-seven states, plus Puerto Rico and Guam, encourage advocacy through the involvement of regional and statewide groups and associations of educators of gifted and talented children. Forty-five states, plus Guam, involve parents, parent groups, and associations in the advocacy for education of the gifted/talented.

3. Forty-two states, plus Puerto Rico and Guam, have state guidelines/approval criteria for education of the gifted programs.

4. Sixteen states, plus Puerto Rico and Guam, have flyers on their gifted/talented programs. Forty-three states, plus Puerto Rico and Guam, have guidelines on practices and procedures for education of the gifted in the individual states. Thirty-two states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, have a directory of gifted/talented programs. Twenty-nine states, plus Puerto Rico and Guam, publish descriptions of local gifted/talented programs. Sixteen states have additional written materials which are available on types of gifted/talented programs, practices, and procedures in the individual states.

5. In 27 states, the state department of education evaluates each local gifted/talented program. These evaluations occur sometimes as often as annually and, in other cases, only once every five years.

6. When asked if the state department of education monitors local gifted/talented programs, three states responded yes. However, when the criteria for state approval was requested, numerous states indicated that the specific components were monitored. The results of this information indicated that state departments of education monitor identification criteria in 25 states, plus Puerto Rico. In 28 states and Puerto Rico program standards are monitored. Program facilities are monitored by the state department of education in 12 states, plus Puerto Rico. The expenditure of funds is monitored in 24 states and Puerto Rico by the state department of education. Other criteria that are monitored by the state department include teacher qualifications, program focus, competitive grant objectives, curriculum, teacher ratios, accreditation, staff development, identification, and regulations.

7. A formal statewide evaluation of gifted/talented programs has been completed in 14 states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico.

8. Twenty-five states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, are required to evaluate their own programs. Eighteen of these states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, must evaluate their own programs annually. In the other states, the evaluation occurs from between every one to five years.

9. Thirty-one states, plus Guam, do not have specific certification requirements for teachers to work with gifted/talented programs. In these cases, training which is required for these teachers include staff development/ inservice, a regular teaching certificate at the appropriate grade level and in the appropriate content area, three

semester hours in education of the gifted, two years of regular classroom teaching experience, attendance at a state institute, and/or no requirement at all. Some states which do not have certification do have an endorsement for education of the gifted and this endorsement is encouraged for all teachers of the gifted.

In 19 states and Puerto Rico there are specific certification requirements. Thirteen states, plus Puerto Rico, require a specific number of graduate hours in education of the gifted. Eight states and Puerto Rico have specific competencies which must be met by the teacher. Three states and Puerto Rico require a specific number of inservice hours. One state, plus Puerto Rico, requires that teachers attend conferences. Other practices which are required for certification include competency tests, completing an approved university program, experience, practicum, special education endorsement, one course and workshops.

10. Twenty-eight states, plus Puerto Rico, have an advisory committee or study commission for education of the gifted. These committees/commissions typically advise, assist, recommend, and/or plan for state departments of education, chief state school officers, and state boards of education.

11. The specialist(s) for gifted and talented may be located within many sections of state departments of education. The most common section for the gifted program to be housed under was in the Special Education Section. Eighteen states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, were housed in this section. Five states found their gifted programs under the Curriculum Section, four states housed the gifted/talented program within the Instruction and Curriculum Section. Three states included the gifted program in the Special Services Section. School Improvement and Instruction each had two states which housed the gifted/talented program in their sections.

    Other sections which were responsible for education of the gifted/talented included Instructional Services for Exceptional Children and Youth, Instruction Support Services Division, Social Studies and Arts, Curriculum Improvement and Support, School Improvement and Performance, Instruction Effectiveness, Education Services, General Academic Education, Program Development, Special Populations, Division of Gifted/Talented Education, Humanities and Secondary Administration and Support Services.

12. The position for a state gifted/talented coordinator originated as far back as the mid 1950s in New York state. Other early states to identify a position for this work included Kansas in 1957 and North Carolina and Ohio in 1959.

13. Forty state departments of education, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, sponsor inservice training on education of the gifted/talented for teachers of the gifted. Thirty-seven states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, provide inservice to regular education teachers on education of the gifted/talented. Thirty-eight states, plus Puerto Rico and Guam, provide inservice to administrators. Support staff receive inservice from state departments of education in 23 states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico. Other groups for which the state department of education provides inservice includes parents, school boards, education service centers, gifted/talented consultants, students, business and community clubs, university classes, guidance counselors, and governor's school administration and faculty.

IV. LOCAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

SP - State Policy
LP - Local Policy
ND - Not Defined

IV. Local Education Agency Services	1. Total number of G/T students receiving services *number estimate NA - data not available	2. Total public school enrollment	3. Percent of G/T students by ethnic group a. Black	b. White	c. Asian/Pacific	d. Hispanic	e. American Indian/Alaskan Native	f. Other (non-English speaking)	NA information not available	4. Types of delivery models used a. Resource room/pullout b. Self-contained classroom c. Regular classroom program plans d. Independent study e. Mentors f. Part-time grouping g. Cluster grouping h. Advanced grade placement i. Advanced subject placement j. Honors/advanced placement k. Individual student plan or IEP l. Seminars m. Mini courses n. Others
Alabama	16,834	NA		7	88	1	1	1		a-m
Alaska	3,854*	103,124 (85-86)	NA							a-m
Arizona	20,000*	585,793 (85-86)		4	67	1	22	6		a-j,l,m
Arkansas	19,928*	437,438	NA							a-l
California	219,073	4,325,000		5	60	19.5	18	.5	2.	a-n(International Baccalanreate)
Colorado	NA		NA							a-m
Connecticut	19,000*	465,000	NA							a,c,n(summer residential program)
Delaware	3,815	94,114	NA							a-m
Florida	47,463	1,607,320		2	92	2	2	2		a-m
Georgia	38,000		NA							a,b,d,e,j,h(facilitator)
Hawaii	15,193*	165,000	NA							a,b,d,e,f,h,i,j,l,m
Idaho	2,510 (85-86)	204,000	NA							a,c,d,e,h,i,j,m
Illinois	86,000*	2,175,472	FY 86	16	74	5	5	1		a-m
Indiana	27,800*	964,885	NA							a-m
Iowa	8,600*	485,686		3	94	1	1	1		a,c-n(summer programs)
Kansas	11,786*	391,786	NA							a-m
Kentucky	25,000*		NA							a-j,l,m
Louisiana	14,000*	750,000	NA							a,b,e,h,k
Maine	NA	211,752	NA							a,c-g,j-n(college coursework)
Maryland	54,000*	665,838		13.6	78	6.9	1.4	.1		a-j,l,m,n(magnet schools)
Massachusetts	NA	846,430	NA							a-m
Michigan	119,708	1,596,035	NA							a-m

5. Special provisions for special populations Defined by State Policy Defined by Local Policy Not Defined a. Culturally and racially diverse b. Low socioeconomic c. Rural d. Handicapped e. Female f. Underachievers	6. How state recognizes 1. Essential or regulatory 2. Desirable or recommended 3. Nonessential or optional a. Student identification procedures	b. Student program placement procedures	c. Multidisciplinary selection teams	d. Regular education program modifications	e. Written program description relating to each students needs and abilities	f. Adaptations of learning environment	g. Use of higher level and critical thinking skills	h. Program management plan	i. Inservice training plan	j. Provisions for program evaluation	k. Adaptations of curriculum
ND SP SP SP ND ND	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2
SP ND SP SP ND	1	1	1	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	3
ND ND ND ND ND ND	1	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	1
Districts are encouraged to give particular attention to these groups No special provisions	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1
ND ND ND ND ND ND	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Target areas for special id.											
LP LP LP LP LP LP	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
State requires non-discriminatory testing and ID based on potential for high achievers	1	1	1	2	3	2	2	1	2	1	1
ND ND ND ND ND ND	2	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	2
Same rules apply to all populations	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1
SP SP ND SP ND ND	1	1	3	3	1	3	1	3	3	1	1
SP SP SP ND ND SP	1	1	3	2	2	3	1	2	1	1	1
None	1		1		1	2	2		2	1	2
ND ND ND ND ND ND	1	2	1	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	2
ND ND ND ND ND ND	1	1	1	2	3	2	1	2	1	1	1
LP ND ND ND ND ND	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	2
LP LP LP SP ND LP	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	2	1	3
ND ND ND ND ND ND	1	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	2	2	2
SP	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	1
ND ND ND ND ND ND	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	2	2	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2
All strongly encouraged by state policy	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
LP LP LP LP LP LP	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

| | | |

Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted
State of the States Survey*

* Responses herein are a compilation of all states.

IV. Local Education Agency Services

1. What is the total number of gifted/talented students receiving service in a gifted/talented program in your state? 1,365 - 219,073
This number is only an estimate ____ Yes ____ No

12 This data is not available

2. What is the total public school enrollment (K-12) for your state?
94,000 - 4,325,000

3. What percent of gifted students within your state are members of various ethnic groups?

Black _____ Hispanic _____

White _____ American Indian/Alaskan Native _____

Asian/Pacific Island _____ Other _____

This information is not available 39

4. What types of program delivery models are used for gifted/talented students by LEAs within your state?

50 Resource room/pullout

43 Self-contained classroom

45 Regular classroom program plans

47 Independent study

47 Mentors

42 Part-time grouping

41 Cluster grouping

42 Advanced grade placement

46 Advanced subject placement

47 Honors/advanced placement

37 Individual student plan or IEP

41 Seminars

40 Mini courses

13 Others (please identify)

5. Special provisions (e.g., identification procedures, materials, etc.) for serving special populations for each of the following are:

Category	a. Defined by State Policy	b. Defined by Local Policy	c. Not Defined
Culturally and Racially diverse	16	14	10
Low Socioeconomic	17	12	9
Rural	23	5	7
Handicapped	15	15	8
Female	24	2	8
Underachievers	22	6	9

6. How does your state recognize the following gifted/talented program elements?

	a. Essential or Regulatory	b. Desirable or Recommended	c. Nonessential or Optional
a. Student identification procedures	38	10	1
b. Student program placement procedures	29	18	--
c. Multidisciplinary selection teams	26	17	5
d. Regular education program modifications	15	31	2
e. Written program description relating to each student's needs and abilities	21	17	10
f. Adaptations of learning environment	11	24	6
g. Use of higher level and critical thinking skills	12	34	3
h. Program management plan	18	26	4
i. Inservice training plan	18	29	2
j. Provisions for program evaluation	25	23	1
k. Adaptations of curriculum	19	28	2

NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE ON LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY SERVICES

1. The number of gifted/talented students receiving service in each of the states varied greatly as would be expected with the various populations of states. The state of North Dakota had 1,365 students receiving services through the gifted/talented program. The state of California had 219,073 students receiving services in a gifted/talented program. Twelve states did not have data available on the number of gifted/talented students in their states receiving services.

2. The state with the smallest total school enrollment K-12 was Delaware with approximately 94,000 students. The greatest total public school enrollment (K-12) was California with 4,325,000 students.

   Data provided on the total public school enrollment and the number of gifted students receiving services is incomplete and inconsistent for a specific school year. However, through an analysis of this information, the state of Idaho had the smallest percentage of students receiving services in a gifted/talented program at approximately 1.2 percent. New Jersey had the highest percentage of students receiving services with 9.9 percent of the school population. The median percentage of all programs for which a percentage of the population was computed was 3.75 percent. There was a bimodal distribution of percentages of students by state receiving services. There were three states which identified 2.9 percent of the population, and three responses which identified 3.0 percent of the population. Using the data from all states which provided both total number of gifted/talented students receiving services and total school enrollment, 4.54% of the population received services through a gifted/talented program.

3. When requesting information on the number of students identified as gifted/talented from various ethnic groups, the most common response was that the information was not available. This was true of 39 states, plus Puerto Rico and Guam. This may suggest that states should collect and analyze data on the percentage of minorities who receive services through a gifted/talented program.

4. The types of program delivery models for gifted/talented students are quite similar across the country. All states, plus Guam, use the resource room or pull-out program. Forty-three states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, use the self-contained classroom model. Forty-five states, plus Puerto Rico, have regular classroom program plans. Forty-seven states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, provide independent study. Forty-seven states, plus Guam, have mentorship programs. Forty-two states, plus Guam, have part-time grouping. Forty-one states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, use cluster grouping. Guam and 42 states allow for

advanced grade placement. Advanced subject placement is used in 46 states plus Guam and Puerto Rico. Honors/advanced placement programs are used in 47 states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico. Thirty-seven states, plus Puerto Rico, use an individual student plan or IEP. Puerto Rico and Guam, plus 41 states, use seminars. Mini courses are used by 40 states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico. Other practices which are used include the International Baccalaureate Program, summer residential programs, and the facilitator model. Other models which were listed but could be considered as a delivery activity would include college course work, magnet schools, consortia, convocations, Olympics of the Mind and Future Problem Solving, fast paced dual enrollment, and regional cooperative activities.

5. When asked if special provisions were provided for culturally and racially diverse students, 16 states, plus Guam, stated that there was no definition as to this practice. Fourteen states stated there was a state policy for this practice. Ten states and Puerto Rico responded to this area of concern through local policies.

   When asked what special provisions were provided for low socio-economic students, 17 states and Guam stated that there was no distinction for this group of students. Twelve states had a state policy to consider students with a low socio-economic background. Nine states and Puerto Rico allowed special provisions for low socio-economic students through local policies.

   Rural students in 23 states, plus Guam, do not receive special provisions for their population. Five states had special policies for rural students. Seven states, plus Puerto Rico, allowed local policies for rural students.

   Special provisions were provided to the handicapped through a state policy in 15 states. Local policies provided special provisions in eight states, plus Puerto Rico. However, 15 states and Guam had no special provision for handicapped gifted students.

   Twenty-four states, plus Guam, did not define any special provision for female gifted/talented students. Two states had a state policy providing a special provision for female gifted/talented students. Eight states, plus Puerto Rico, allowed local policies to develop special provisions for the identification of female gifted students.

   Underachievers in 22 states and Guam do not have any special provisions for identification. Six states had a state policy allowing special provisions for underachievers. Nine states, plus Puerto Rico, allowed local policies allowing special provisions for the identification of gifted/talented underachievers.

6. Student identification procedures were recognized as essential/regulatory for 38 states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico. Ten states recognized identification procedures as desirable/recommended. One state considered identification procedures to be nonessential/optional.

Twenty-nine states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, recognized student program placement procedures as essential/ regulatory. Eighteen states considered program placement procedures as desirable/recommended.

Twenty-six states, plus Puerto Rico, considered it to be essential/regulatory to have multidisciplinary selection teams. Seventeen states considered this to be desirable/ recommended. Five states considered multidisciplinary selection teams to be nonessential/optional.

Fifteen states suggested that regular education program modifications were essential/regulatory. Thirty-one states, plus Guam, recognized regular education program modifications as desirable/recommended. Regular education program modifications were considered nonessential/optional by two states.

A written program description relating to each student's needs and abilities was considered essential/regulatory in 21 states, plus Puerto Rico. Seventeen states, plus Guam, considered this individualizing to each student's needs and abilities as desirable/recommended. Ten states felt that a program description relating to each student's needs and abilities was nonessential/optional.

Adaptations of the learning environment was considered essential/regulatory by 11 states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico. Twenty-four states felt this was desirable/ recommended. Six states considered adaptations of the learning environment as nonessential/ optional.

Twelve states, plus Puerto Rico and Guam, considered the use of higher level and critical thinking skills to be essential/regulatory. Thirty-four states felt the use of higher level and critical thinking skills to be desirable/ recommended. Three states felt these skills were nonessential/optional.

A program management plan was considered nonessential/ optional by four states, while 26 states felt this was desirable/recommended. Eighteen states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico, felt it essential to have a program management plan.

Likewise, 18 states, plus Puerto Rico and Guam, recognized the need for an inservice training plan as essential/ regulatory. Twenty-nine states felt the inservice training plan was desirable/recommended. Two states felt the inservice training plan was nonessential or optional.

Provisions for program evaluation was considered to be essential/regulatory by 25 states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico. Twenty-three states considered provisions for program evaluation to be desirable/recommended. One state felt this should be nonessential/optional.

Adaptations of the curriculum were recognized as essential/regulatory by 19 states, plus Guam and Puerto Rico. Adaptations of the curriculum were considered to be nonessential/optional by two states, while 28 states considered this to be desirable/recommended.

V. PRIVATE AND PUBLIC COLLABORATION

V. Private and Public Collaboration	1. State-sponsored summer institutes for teachers	2. Number of the SDE sponsored gifted/talented program a. Residential schools b. Summer programs c. Staurday/after school programs d Governor's school(s) e. Special academic year schools	3. a. Business consortium or business/ industry linkage established (1) at state level (2) at local level	b. If yes, which do these provide (1) supplemental dollars for direct services to students (2) funds for teacher inservice preservice training (3) funds for summer institutes (4) an active advocacy group (5) a lobbying group	4. Utilizing public Intern/Mentor program	5. a. TRUSTS AND FOUNDATIONS fund G/T b. If yes, are funds used to supplement or supplant funding
Alabama		1 1 proposed 88-89 None	2	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Alaska	None	None	No		Yes	No
Arizona		1	No		No	No
Arkansas	None	1 1	2	NA	No	NA
California	None	2 (Math Science Academies)	2	1,3,4,5	Unknown	Yes Supplement
Colorado		None	2	NA	No	Yes Supplement
Connecticut	Co-sponsor Confratute at U-Conn & Institute at Sacred Heart Univ.	1 1 1	1	5	No	Yes Supplement
Delaware	None	1	No		No	No
Florida	State university coursework	1 1	1,2	1,2,4	Yes	Yes Supplement
Georgia	None	1	1	4,5	Unknown	N/A
Hawaii	Coordinated effort with Nat. & St. Leadership Training Institute	1 1	2	1,3,4,5	Yes	No
Idaho	College of Idaho	2	No		No	No
Illinois	Under the auspices of Ed. Service Center	1	NA		No	Yes
Indiana	None	None	2	1	Yes	Yes Supplement
Iowa	Contag at U. of Northern Iowa	None	1		No	No
Kansas	None	None	No		No	No
Kentucky	Ky. Assn. for Gifted Education	1 1 1	2	1	Yes	Yes Supplement
Louisiana			NA		No	No
Maine	Annual Summer Training Institute for the Education of Gifted and Talented	Y	No		No	Yes Supplement
Maryland	NA	1	1	3	No	No
Massachusetts	None		2			Yes Supplement & Supplant

Michigan	None		5					2	1,2,3	Yes	Yes	Supplement	
Minnesota	None							2	1,2,3	No	Yes	Supplement	
						proposed							
Mississippi	None	None						1,2	1,2	Information NA			
Missouri	Teacher Academy		1	1	1			No					
Montana	None	None						No		No	Yes	Supplement	
Nebraska								2	1	No	Yes	Supplement	
Nevada	None					2		2		No	No		
New Hampshire	Governor's Institute in Gifted Education							1,2	1,2,3,4		Yes		
New Jersey	None					3		2	1,2,3,4,5	Yes (Project ROLE)			
New Mexico	None							Unknown		No	No		
New York	Yes		6					2		No	No		
North Carolina	Yes					1		1,2	1,3,5	No	Yes	Supplement	
North Dakota								No		No	No		
Ohio	Governor's Summer Institutes for Gifted (13) & Essex School f/t Gifted			1	1	1		2		No	Yes	Supplement	
Oklahoma	Workshops	None						1		No	No		
Oregon	Univ. of Oregon	None						1,2	1	No	No		
Pennsylvania	NA					5		2	1,3	No	Yes	Supplement	
Rhode Island			1					1,2	1	No	Yes	Supplement	
South Carolina			10		2			No		No	No		
South Dakota	Sioux Falls Workshop on Secondary Curr.					1		No		No	No		
Tennessee						Y		No		No			
Texas	Institutes for teachers of young disadvantage/Gifted Basic Training for Gifted			3		1		No		Information NA	Yes	Supplement & Supplant	
Utah		None						1		No	No		
Vermont	Conference with St. College or University			3				No		No	Yes	Supplement & Supplant	
Virginia			5	17	5	5		1,2	1,3,4,5	Yes(NASA)	Yes	Supplement	
Washington	Univ. of Washington, Eastern Washington Univ. Whitworth College, & Seatle Univ.							1,2	2	Yes(bus. & industry intern/ mentor program)	Yes	Supplement	
West Virginia				Y		Y		No			No		
Wisconsin	Science World, Arts World, Bus. World			1	1			1,2	2,3	No	No		
Wyoming	None							No		No	No		

	Guam	Puerto Rico
V. Private and Public Collaboration		
1. State-sponsored summer institutes for teachers	None	Univ. of Puerto Rico, International American Univ., Mendez Foundation
2. Number of the SDE sponsored gifted/talented program		1
a. Residential schools	1	
b. Summer programs	1	
c. Staurday/after school programs		
d. Governor's school(s)		
e. Special academic year schools		
3. a. Business consortium or business/industry linkage established	No	No
(1) at state level		
(2) at local level		
b. If yes, which do these provide		
(1) supplemental dollars for direct services to students		
(2) funds for teacher inservice preservice training		
(3) funds for summer institutes		
(4) an active advocacy group		
(5) a lobbying group		
4. Utilizing public Intern/Mentor program	No	No
5. a. TRUSTS AND FOUNDATIONS fund G/T	No	No
b. If yes, are funds used to supplement or supplant funding		

Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted
State of the States Survey*

* Responses herein are a compilation of all states.

V. Private and Public Collaboration

1. Please list the state-sponsored summer institutes for training teachers of the gifted.
16-none 12-blank 2-not available 18-at least one

2. How many of each of the following state department of education sponsored gifted/talented programs are presently in existence in your state?

a. Residential schools 4

b. Summer programs for students 21

c. Saturday/after school programs 6

d. Governor's school(s) 16

e. Special academic year schools 3

* Please identify the state organizations with contact person and address which support education for the gifted.

3. a. Has a business consortium or business/industry linkage been established in your state?

	Yes	No
at the state level	15	
at the local level	25	

b. If yes, do these programs provide

	Yes	No
1) supplemental dollars to local school districts for direct services to students.	14	
2) funds for __ teacher inservice __ preservice training.	8	
3) funds for summer institutes for gifted students.	11	
4) active advocacy.	7	
5) lobbying group for gifted education.	7	

4. Are schools in your state utilizing public Intern/Mentor programs such as the U.S. Postal Mentor Program? Yes 9 No 32

Please list others used _____

5. a. Do TRUSTS AND FOUNDATIONS fund gifted programs in your state? Yes 22 No 21

b. If yes, are these funds used to supplement or supplant funding for gifted Programs?

Supplement Yes 19 No ____

Supplant Yes ____ No ____

Supplement & Supplant - 3

NATIONAL PERSPECTIVE ON PRIVATE AND PUBLIC COLLABORATION

1. Eighteen states, plus Puerto Rico, listed at least one state-sponsored summer institute for training teachers of the gifted.

2. Four states identified at least one residential school within their state. Twenty-one states, plus Puerto Rico and Guam, had at least one summer program for gifted/talented students. Six states, plus Guam, have Saturday/after school programs for the gifted. Governor's schools are held in 16 states. Special academic year schools were found in three states.

   * Although on the questionnaire at this point information is requested on state organizations, this information is reported under Section VI, State Progress/Needs, at the end of each individual state's response.

3. Fifteen states have a business consortium or business/industry linkage at the state level. Twenty-five states have a business consortium or business/industry linkage at the local level. Nine states have these consortium or linkages at both the state and local level.

   In 14 states the business consortium or business/industry linkage provides supplemental dollars to local school districts for direct services to students. In eight states the result of these practices provide funding for teacher inservice and/or preservice training. Summer institutes for gifted students are funded through this business/industry linkage in 11 states. In seven states these contacts provide an active advocacy for education of the gifted. Also in seven states, the business/industry resource allows for a lobbying group for gifted/talented programs.

4. Nine states are presently utilizing public intern/mentor programs. In addition, the following are used: U.S. Postal Mentor Program, Project ROLES, NASA, and the Business and Industry Intern/Mentor Program.

5. In 22 states trusts and foundations are used to supplement funding for gifted/talented programs. In three of these 22 states, trusts and foundations both supplement and supplant funding for gifted/talented programs.

VI. STATE PROGRESS/NEEDS

VI. State Progress/Needs

In the 1987 Edition of The State of The States Gifted and Talented Education, each state will have one page to include the state's definition of gifted/talented and a statement on current progress in education of the gifted/talented. The responses to the questions on this page will be the statement on current programs. Since editing will be minimal, please respond to all of the questions on one page and in a manner acceptable for publication. In addition, please attach a copy of your state definition of gifted/talented.

1. What do you see as the greatest strengths of programs in your state?

2. What are the areas in relation to education of the gifted that you perceive as needing improvement within your state?

3. What do you perceive as areas within education of the gifted/talented in your state which have potential for expansion?

4. How have gifted/talented programs faired within your state during the 1986-87 school year?

5. Has your state department been involved with any major research effort regarding education of the gifted/talented in the last year?
   Yes _____ No _____

   If yes, please describe.

ALABAMA

"Intellectually Gifted" students are those children and youth who are identified as possessing demonstrated or potential abilities for highly refined cognitive functioning (including creative or productive thinking) and who by reason thereof require services or activities not ordinarily provided by the school.

The greatest strengths of programs in Alabama are: (a) programs use consistent identification criteria statewide which facilitates students' transferring from one program to another within the state; (b) certification standards for teachers of the gifted; and (c) each LEA must develop a plan for the education of its gifted students (program evaluation is one component of that plan).

Areas which could be improved within Alabama include: (a) funding for gifted programs which needs to be specifically designated within the special education budget (a 1987 funding proposal under development takes this into consideration); (b) increased involvement of regular education personnel so the child's total educational program meets individual students' needs; (c) a full range of program options, such as more special classes and schools, in addition to enrichment services; and (d) early identification and appropriate K-2 programming.

Areas with potential for expansion include: (a) use of resources within business and industry, especially in rural areas; (b) continued refinement of procedures for identifying the disadvantaged and culturally diverse gifted; (c) possible expansion of services to preschool gifted; (d) more teacher training with master teachers in "real world" settings; (e) more model programs in LEAs and demonstration schools; and (f) more facilities using modern equipment and up-to-date supplies and materials.

With a five percent (5%) proration of funds, no educational program has fared well in Alabama during the past year. Since 1980, Alabama has had four (4) years of proration. Gifted programs, however, have not suffered any more than other programs.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Jonatha Vare, Education Specialist
Program for Exceptional Children
Alabama State Department of Education
1020 Monticello Court
Montgomery, AL 36117
(205) 261-5099

ALABAMA (continued)

State organizations include:

Alabama Association for the Talented and Gifted (ALATAG)
Dr. Gail Lambright, President
University of South Alabama, ILB 229
Mobile, AL 36688

ALASKA

The greatest strength of programs in Alaska is local control with programs designed to fit local community needs.

Areas relating to education of the gifted that need improvement are: (a) standards for program implementation; (b) funding accountability; and, (c) gifted/talented teacher training/qualifications.

Teacher training practices could also be expanded.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Laurel Tatsuda, Program Manager
Bilingual-Bicultural and Gifted and Talented Education
Office of Special Services
Department of Education
P.O. Box F
Juneau, AK 99811-500
(907) 465-2970

State organizations include:

Governor's Council for the Handicapped and Gifted
600 University Ave., Suite B
Fairbanks, AK 99709

Alaskans for Gifted and Talented Education (AGATE)
Marcia Romick, Coordinator
Fairbanks North Star Borough School District
Box 1250
Fairbanks, AK 99707

ARIZONA

Arizona has a strong advocacy group (AAGT), with 1,200 parent and/or teacher members who support gifted education. Many districts are providing strong gifted programs with local funds.

There remains a need, however, for rules and regulations (policies and procedures); administrator support; inservice; and a better funding system for gifted services and programs. Services for the gifted could be extended through better programs for preschool and young gifted children. Also, improved testing and counseling services for gifted students would strengthen Arizona services.

During the 1986-87 school year, budget cuts have resulted in program cutbacks in some districts.

A computer survey is presently being undertaken to develop a database on types of gifted programs, identification procedures, numbers of students and teachers, budgets, and ethnic percentages.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Janet Gore, State Coordinator
Gifted Program Specialist
Arizona Department of Education
1535 West Jefferson
Phoenix, AZ 85007
(602) 255-5031

State organizations include:

AAGT - Arizona Association for Gifted/Talented
Nancy Stahl, President
(602) 867-5122

CGEP - Coordinator of Gifted Education Programs
Jerry Barkan
(602) 326-1994

Task Force for Gifted Concerns
Nina Nelson
(602) 878-5560

ARKANSAS

In Arkansas, gifted and talented children and youth are identified as those of high potential or ability whose learning characteristics and educational needs require qualitatively differentiated educational experiences and/or services.

Possession of these talents and gifts, or the potential for their development, will be evidenced through an interaction of above average intellectual ability, task commitment and/or motivation, and creative ability.

One of the strengths of programs in Arkansas came as the result of being allowed to spend up to two years in planning and developing a gifted program before the implementation phase. Having program approval standards that are clear and have an element of flexibility assists districts in providing services that are of high quality and can be tailored to local needs. The inclusive definition keeps the programs from being fragmented and allows identification for potential as well as demonstrated achievement/ability. Positions as supervisors of gifted programs in the area Education Service Cooperatives have been funded by the Department of Education. These persons provide technical assistance to LEA's and maintain an effective communications network.

As gifted programs are still very new in most Arkansas districts, there is need for curriculum development with an aim toward comprehensiveness and continuity. Evaluation procedures need refinement.

It is hoped that in the future, state-funded summer programs for gifted students can be expanded to serve children younger than high school age.

The 1986-87 school year was the first year that 240 school districts operated programs for their gifted/talented students. This is a tremendous increase. In 1984-85, there were 13 operational programs and in 1985-86, 33.

Present research efforts include a follow-up study on Arkansas Governor's School students from 1980 to the present.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Martha Bass, Program Advisor
Programs for Gifted/Talented
Room 105C, Education Building
4 Capitol Mall
Little Rock, AR 72201
(501) 371-5437

ARKANSAS (continued)

State organizations include:

Arkansans for Gifted and Talented Education (AGATE)
P.O. Box 55286
Hillcrest Station
Little Rock, AR 72225
Rick Tremblay, President

CALIFORNIA

The gifted and talented program in California provides opportunities for students from all backgrounds to "operate at the boundaries of their abilities," and to "test and push back personal limits" (A Nation at Risk). Student personal growth and satisfaction, ability to contribute to the economic base of society, and ability to participate effectively and lead in a durable, democratic society are the educational goals for California's general and gifted programs.

The program in California must continue to identify and serve pupils from all of its populations. California's demography is changing rapidly, and a healthy gifted program must provide the assurance of access to appropriately challenging education opportunities for all--cutting across socio-economic and cultural lines. The underrepresented populations must be the target for extraordinary efforts to identify and serve gifted youngsters.

If the gifted program is not strengthened financially and mandated for all districts, we run the risk of (a) providing unequal opportunity to pupils for appropriate education, based upon geography (where the pupil lives) and (b) losing a demanding and affluent constituency to the private school system, if the public system is perceived as uncaring about providing for its gifted pupils. This will create a truly elitist society, in which those underchallenged children whose parents can afford private schools will leave the public system, and those who are equally able but not sufficiently economically advantaged are left, "stuck" in a system not addressing their needs. How do we suppose those with no commitment to a public system will vote on issues of expensive public education programming?

This is a pertinent time to discuss the value of gifted education to the state as a whole. This year was one of challenge to the gifted program in California. Public outcry and a massive organizing of the GATE constituency managed to change the Governor's original proposal to eliminate the program into a full funding of the program with the statutory 6% COLA.

The California State Department of Education is currently involved in research on the college-able and potentially-gifted pupils from our underrepresented (black and hispanic) populations. GATE is involved in the SDE priority efforts to increase the numbers of college-eligible (and enrolled) pupils from the black and hispanic populations.

CALIFORNIA (continued)

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Linda Forsyth, Consultant
State Department of Education
Gifted and Talented Education
P.O. Box 944272
Sacramento, CA 94228-2720
(916) 323-4781

State organizations include:

California Association for the Gifted (with 22 affiliates)
Sharon Mountford, Administrative Assistant
23684 Schoenborn St.
Canoga Park, CA 91304

COLORADO

One of the greatest strengths of Colorado programs for the gifted is the program diversity from district to district. Efforts are being made to provide programming that is more integral to the overall district program, moving away from part-time, fragmented approaches. A move toward documenting of Individual Education Plans for gifted/talented students is another strength of Colorado programs.

The areas which continue to need improvement include: (a) parent empowerment; (b) consistent support funding; (c) increased ownership on the part of regular classroom teachers; (d) services responsive to student's identified needs; and (e) consideration of special populations.

During the 1986-87 school year, funding shortfalls have reduced personnel support within local school districts. Areas of need could be addressed through increased legislative support; higher education support; administrative commitment; and, ownership at the LEA level.

The state of Colorado has been involved in the review of a state funded project involving 22 school districts (2+2 Project), examining major program components and documenting ways to improve the function of those components (e.g. K-3 services, telecommunications applications, secondary curriculum innovations).

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Dr. Jerry Villars, State Coordinator
Gifted and Talented Student Programming
Colorado Department of Education
201 E. Colfax
Denver, CO 80203
(303) 866-6765

State organizations include:

Colorado Association for the Gifted and Talented (CAG/T)
Box 10845, U.P. Station
Denver, CO 80210
Contact: Kay Wergedal, 2900 Sherman, Englewood, Co 80110

CONNECTICUT

Currently, the greatest strengths in Connecticut gifted programs are: (a) excellent quality of teaching staff; (b) diversity and sophistication of program models; and (c) flexibility to establish programs meeting local needs.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include: (a) ongoing evaluation/monitoring of programs; (b) monitoring of appropriate use of RDIM; and (c) the gifted student's total program - especially the ownership by regular classroom teachers.

Expansion efforts could be directed toward programs for students who are talented in the arts, programs for students in primary grades, and comprehensive high school programs.

During the 1986-87 school year, programs have grown. As a result, Connecticut may be a step closer to legislation to mandate program services.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Alan White
Gifted/Talented Programs
State Department of Education
165 Capitol Ave.
Hartford, CT 06145
(203) 566-3695

State organizations include:

Connecticut Association for the Gifted (CAG)
Jack Brooks, President
24 Beechwood Dr.
Meriden, CT 06450

Connecticut Educators Network for the Talented and Gifted (CENTAG)
Peg Beecher, President
RESCUE
R.R. 2
Goshen Rd.
Litchfield, CT 06759

DELAWARE

Currently, the greatest strengths in Delaware gifted programs are: (a) flexibility and local responsibility in programming so that districts can meet their students' needs; (b) teacher and administrative initiative and dedication; and (c) commitment by the state to a full-time gifted/talented supervisor.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include: (a) awareness of and service to needs of the gifted by administrators and "regular" teachers; (b) program evaluation at the local level; and (c) better communication with parents and the public.

Expansion efforts could be directed toward summer programs, after-school and weekend options, and services to secondary students beyond honors and advanced placement.

During the 1986-87 school year, there have been increased professional development opportunities through "creative" use of resources.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Peggy Dee, State Supervisor
Gifted and Talented Programs
State Department of Public Instruction
P.O. Box 1402
Townsend Building
Dover, DE 19903
(302) 736-4667

State organizations include:

Delaware TAG
Ms. Terry Flood, President
Cape Henlopen School District
Rehobeth Junior High
500 Stockley St.
Rehobeth, DE 19971

FLORIDA

Currently, the greatest strengths in Florida gifted programs are: (a) mandated legislation; (b) supportive budget of $68 million; (c) being housed in Exceptional Student Education; and (d) cooperative relationship with universities.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include: (a) expansion of definition; (b) increased identification of minorities; and (c) Governor's Programs of Excellence.

Expansion efforts in Florida could be directed toward (a) summer programs; (b) dual enrollment; and (c) self-contained programs rather than resource classrooms.

During the 1986-87 school year, expansion has occurred both in numbers of students and allocated dollars. The state has also been involved in a research project which is examining the criteria for eligibility. It is anticipated that any change in criteria will result in the identification of students who are representative of the population.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Judy Miller, Program Specialist
Gifted Programs
DOE/Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students
Knott Building
Tallahassee, FL 32399
(904) 488-3103

State organizations include:

Florida Association for the Gifted
Ms. Jan Rouse
1895 Gulf-to-Bay Blvd.
Clearwater, FI. 33515

GEORGIA

The gifted student is one who demonstrates a high degree of intellectual ability and who needs special instruction and/or special ancillary services in order to achieve at levels commensurate with his/her intellectual ability. One of Georgia's strengths is that the Department of Education, Division for Exceptional Students Regulations and Procedures for Programs for the Gifted (Code IDDD) provides requirements to 186 LEAs to implement the state mandate for gifted education. Adherence to these guidelines provides funding to LEAs for gifted education programs, which is $23,339,814 for FY 88. In addition, teachers must be certified to teach gifted students.

Certification, however, needs to be upgraded from an endorsement and the teacher training programs need to be state-approved. The Department continues to research certification needs, staff development, and curriculum development for gifted education. Resource manuals are being developed.

There will be an expansion of business/education partnerships for gifted education programs in Georgia, including mentorships/ internships and sponsorship of academic competitions.

During the 1986-87 school year, programs for the intellectually gifted in Georgia have remained mandated and funded under the new state education law, the Quality Basic Education (QBE) Act.

The Georgia Department of Education, Office of Instructional Programs, Division for Exceptional Students, Programs for the Gifted, funded a statewide needs assessment conducted by the University of Georgia's Torrance Center for Gifted and Creative Studies and, based upon those results, hosted workshops for teachers and administrators of the gifted. The primary need identified was curriculum.

The Georgia Department of Education, Office of Instructional Programs, Division for Exceptional Students, Programs for the Gifted, conducted a survey of the 186 Georgia LEAs asking them to describe any methods the system used or proposed to use to evaluate the effectiveness of the program for the gifted. Although all LEAs used state monitoring of gifted programs as a method of gifted program evaluation, few of them had formalized written procedures and a process for program evaluation beyond compliance with minimal state requirements. The review of the data indicates the need statewide for inservice training in the area of evaluation of the programs for the gifted.

GEORGIA (continued)

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Christopher E. Nelson, Coordinator
Programs for the Gifted
Department of Education
Twin Towers East, Suite 1970
Atlanta, GA 30334
(404) 656-6317

State organizations include:

Georgia Supporters for the Gifted
Mrs. Paula DeWeese, President
2630 Willow Green Dr.
Duluth, GA 30136
(404) 923-4684

HAWAII

"Gifted and talented are children and youth whose superior performance or potential indicates possible giftedness in intellectual, creative, or specific academic abilities, leadership capability, psychomotor ability, or talent in the performing and visual arts."

Hawaii's greatest strength is that there is a one-state school system and therefore, a consistent program is found in every district.

Presently, a K-12 Scope and Sequence is being developed for the Gifted/Talented Curriculum. This will help to ensure that in all of the gifted/talented classes there will be some consistency in the gifted/talented curriculum.

Through the efforts of the parents, educators, and community organizations, the 1987 state legislature appropriated positions so that every secondary school would have a position specifically earmarked for the gifted/talented.

More positions for the gifted are needed for expansion in the other areas of giftedness, especially in the visual/performing arts.

This school year, the gifted/talented programs have progressed tremendously. Identification measures have improved and gifted/talented programs are implementing a differentiated curriculum for the gifted.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Vivian Hee
Education Specialist, Gifted and Talented
Office of Instructional Services
189 Lunalilo Homo Road
Honolulu, HI 96825
(808) 395-9590

State organizations include:

State Advisory Council for G/T (has an annual state conference on G/T).

Hawaii Association for Intellectually Gifted Children (HAIGC)

IDAHO

Gifted/talented refers to those students who are identified as possessing demonstrated or potential abilities that give evidence of high performing capabilities in intellectual, creative, specific academic and/or leadership areas, or ability in the performing or visual arts.

Currently, the greatest benefit of Idaho gifted programs is the continued enrichment and stimulation for individual students.

In Idaho, the relationship of programming for gifted/talented with programming for all students needs to be appreciated through more building collaboration between gifted/talented and regular educators.

Expansion efforts could be directed toward encouraging use of the consultation model where gifted/talented educators present in regular classrooms. This implementation model has potential for benefitting more students and regular educators in developing critical thinking/problem solving skills.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Martha Noffsinger
Supervisor of Special Education
State Department of Education
Len B. Jordan Office Building
650 West State
Boise, ID 83720
(208) 334-3940

State organizations include:

CEC G/T Chapter, 1987-88
Rhea Zaldane, President
Valivue District #139
Tenth and Karcher
Caldwell, ID 83605

ILLINOIS

Currently, the greatest strengths in Illinois gifted programs are: (a) the linkage network of local, regional, and state delivery of services; (b) the Illinois Statewide Talent Search and corresponding services for the highly gifted students; and (c) the commitment of local districts.

According to the "Gifted Education in Illinois" report, the state is committed to addressing the following: (a) that appropriate educational programs are available to the gifted and talented students who need and can profit from them; (b) that students have equal access to programs and services for gifted and talented students; and (c) that the educational programs provided for gifted and talented students meet general standards of adequacy and appropriateness.

The area of visual and performing arts has potential for expansion as well as sequential programs in all content areas and encompassing all grade levels.

During the 1986-87 school year, Illinois has had the highest funding level in the history of the gifted program. Additionally, in April, the State Board of Education adopted a new policy statement.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Wilma Lund
Gifted Education Coordinator
Curriculum Improvement Section N-242
Illinois State Board of Education
100 N. First St.
Springfield, IL 62777
(217) 782-2826

State organizations include:

Illinois Council for Gifted (parents)
Shelia Wildermuth
Hillchrest Elementary
451 22nd Ave.
East Moline, IL 61244

Northern Illinois Planning Commission for Gifted Education
(coordinators and teachers)
Romains Capps, President
Forreston Grade School
401 S. First Ave.
Box 665
Forreston, IL 61030

ILLINOIS (continued)

Central Illinois Planning Commission for Gifted Education
(coordinators and teachers)
Dr. Susan Linnemeyer, President
Champaign Community Unit 4
703 S. New St.
Champaign, IL 61820

Southern Illinois Planning Commission for Gifted Education
(coordinators and teachers)
Joanne Garross, President
21 May Ave.
Carterville, IL 62918

INDIANA

Currently, the greatest strengths in Indiana gifted programs are: (a) the diversity of programs; (b) a wide variety of available options; (c) local staff development; and (d) a strong networking of area gifted/talented coordinators.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include: (a) differentiated curriculum articulated K-12; (b) local program evaluation; (c) counseling components; and (d) increasing the number of programs for visual/performing arts and leadership.

Expansion efforts could be directed toward a sophisticated system of providing technical assistance to LEAs as they plan and implement their gifted/talented programs (3 state G/T - materials, resource center).

During the 1986-87 school year, LEA's have made a commitment to gifted/talented education, both in dollars and people. LEA's augment state funds significantly. Also, an identification guide, which addresses all state recognized areas of gifted, and which gives special attention to the underrepresented and underserved populations, has been developed.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Patricia B. Stafford, Program Manager
Gifted/Talented Education
Indiana Department of Education
229 State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204
(317) 269-9663

State organizations include:

Indiana Association for the Gifted
Mrs. Jan Falkerson, President
1229 King's Cove Ct.
Indianapolis, IN 46260

IOWA

"Gifted and talented children" are those identified as possessing outstanding abilities who are capable of high performance.

Gifted and talented children are children who require appropriate instruction and education services commensurate with their abilities and needs beyond those provided by the regular school program.

Gifted and talented children include those children with demonstrated achievement or potential ability, or both, in any of the following areas or in combination: (1) general intellectual ability; (2) creative thinking; (3) leadership ability; (4) visual and performing arts ability; and (5) specific ability aptitude.

All local gifted education programs receiving state approval are required to do comprehensive planning in order to be initially approved, and to have yearly program evaluations for program improvement. As a result, levels of local ownership are high.

Identification of and provision of appropriate programs for ethnic and language-diverse students is the area in which much improvement is needed. These populations are underserved.

Proposed new standards for accreditation of schools (both public and private) require a program of services for gifted students. This will result in a doubling in the number of programs over two years.

The number of programs has increased slightly over the previous year, even though they are funded mostly from local property taxes. Very few districts have cut their gifted/talented programs to save taxes.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Leland Wolf
Consultant, Gifted Education
Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319-0146
(515) 281-3198

State organizations include:

Iowa Talented and Gifted
Judy Jeffrey, President
Council Bluffs Community Schools
12 Scott St.
Council Bluffs, IA 51501

KANSAS

Intellectually gifted children and youth are those who have potential for outstanding performance by virtue of superior intellectual abilities. "Intellectually gifted means outstanding performance or potential for outstanding performance by virtue of superior intellectual abilities." Both students with demonstrated achievement and students with minimal or low performance who give evidence of high potential in general intellectual ability, specific academic aptitudes, and/or creative thinking abilities are included in this definition.

Currently, the greatest strengths in Kansas gifted programs are: (a) parent advocacy; (b) historical basis of support for education of the gifted; (c) strong university training programs providing quality teachers of the gifted; (d) parental rights, including the right to a due process hearing; and (e) assistance of an Equal Education Opportunity Section which supports training in the identification of minority and underachieving gifted.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include: (a) consistency of programming practices across the state; (b) local administrator support; and (c) increased support of regular education teachers.

Expansion efforts in Kansas could be directed toward: (a) identification of leadership skills; (b) identification of talents in the arts; (c) increased identification and programming for minorities and underachievers; and (d) funding.

During the 1986-87 school year, the class size/caseload for the consulting teacher implementation model was approved for an increase from 45 students per teacher to 75 students per teacher. However, with this change is the request by the State Board of Education to monitor practices in this implementation model. Programs using this model will, therefore, be closely observed and evaluated during the next school year to be certain that students' needs are being addressed.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Woody Houseman
Education Program Specialist
Kansas State Department of Education
120 E. 10th St.
Topeka, KS 66612
(913) 296-3743

KANSAS (continued)

State organizations include:

Kansas Association for Gifted/Talented/Creative
Ms. Debbie Haltom, President
Seward County Community College
Box 1137
Liberal, KS 67901

KENTUCKY

Gifted children and youth are those who, by virtue of outstanding abilities, are capable of high performance and leadership and who have been identified by professionally qualified persons. These are pupils who require qualitatively differentiated educational programs and/or services beyond those normally provided by the regular school program in order to realize self-fulfillment and to maximize their contribution to society.

Currently, the greatest strengths in Kentucky gifted programs are substantial funding and an advisory council appointed by the Governor.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include more consistency among school district programs and better identification methods.

During the 1986-87 school year, gifted programs have fared well due to continued state funding. A research study has also been undertaken concerning the effectiveness of self-contained versus pull-out gifted programs.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Nijel Clayton, Program Manager
Gifted/Talented Education
Kentucky Department of Education
1831 Capitol Plaza Tower
Frankfort, KY 40601
(502) 564-2672

State organizations include:

Kentucky Association for Gifted Education
Dr. Julia Roberts, President
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, KY 42101

LOUISIANA

Currently, the greatest strengths in Louisiana gifted programs are: (a) a Department of Education, State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education, and Legislature that support gifted and talented education; (b) parents who are united and vocal with their support; and (c) teachers who are well trained and dedicated.

There is a need for more sharing and communication between local education agencies which are mandated to serve the gifted. This would ensure more uniform services and a higher quality of services across the state.

Expansion efforts should be directed toward the preschool and talent programs which are not provided in all the local education agencies within the state.

During the 1986-87 school year, services have continued to be mandated by law but the budget continues to receive cuts each year.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Patricia Dial, State Supervisor
Gifted and Talented Programs
Louisiana Department of Education
P.O. Box 94064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804-9064
(504) 342-3635

State organizations include:

State B/T Parent Association
Maureen McArthur, President
4337 Lake Limestone
Baton Rouge, LA 70816

MAINE

Gifted and talented children shall mean those children in grades K-12 who excel or have the potential to excel beyond their age peers in the regular school program to the extent that they need and can benefit from programs for the gifted and talented. Gifted and talented children shall receive specialized instruction through these programs if they have exceptional ability, aptitude, skill, or creativity in one or more of the following categories:

1. General intellectual ability as shown by demonstrated significant achievement or potential for significant accomplishment above their age peers in all academic areas;

2. Specific academic aptitude as shown by demonstrated significant achievement or potential for significant accomplishment above their age peers in one or more academic areas;

3. Artistic ability as shown by demonstrated significant achievement or potential for significant accomplishment above their age peers in the literary, performing, and/or visual arts.

Children with exceptional general intellectual ability and/or exceptional specific academic aptitude usually comprise five percent of the school population. Children with exceptional artistic ability usually comprise five percent of the school population. Children in the top two percent of the school population may be considered highly gifted.

Gifted and talented educational programs in Maine are characterized by a strong philosophical commitment among administrators and teachers to the education of the gifted and talented. Partnerships between these programs and the regular education program are supported and reflected in the growing integration of special services within the general school program. Innovation and flexibility in design is encouraged and pursued in recognition of the diverse educational contexts in our large rural state. This, coupled with an enthusiasm and seriousness of purpose for meeting student needs in an effective and appropriate manner, has yielded programs and opportunities that thoughtfully address the gifts and talents of Maine students. Maine educators experienced in this area of education are generous in sharing their knowledge and skills with their colleagues across the state, and are a significant resource as the state commitment to gifted and talented education expands.

In 1985, the 112th Maine Legislature passed legislation requiring all school administrative units to establish educational programs for gifted and talented children in grades K-12 in academics and the arts by 1991-1992. Programs are to be phased in over the next five years according to locally developed plans submitted to the state for approval. In order to assist schools to build the

MAINE (continued)

capacity to deliver comprehensive services in an effective and timely manner, there is a need to increase access to training opportunities, to expand the state capacity to deliver technical assistance, and to refine the process for reviewing program development and delivery.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Valerie Seaberg, Director
Gifted and Talented Programs
Maine Department of Educational Services
State House Station #23
Augusta, ME 04333
(207) 289-5952

State organizations include:

Maine Educators of the Gifted and Talented
c/o Lynne Hall
15 Fremont St.
Machias, ME 04654

MARYLAND

The Maryland State Department of Education has had a long and successful history with its summer centers program. This program offers 58 courses of study at 13 centers on 15 sites across the state. Approximately 2,600 students in grades 4-12 participate. These students demonstrate outstanding academic or intellectual ability, or are talented in the visual and performing arts. The centers provide unique enrichment and/or acceleration opportunities for intensive learning experiences in such areas as physical and environmental sciences, mathematics and/or computer programming, the humanities and creative writing, the visual and performing arts, leadership development, internships in government and economics, and international (political and social science) studies. Most centers are residential, allowing for statewide participation and rich evening programs for students.

Maryland has a wide diversity of school year programs for gifted and talented students across the state due to encouraging, as contrasted to mandatory, legislation. This diversity has allowed for several innovative programs and examples of "state of the art" staff development programs, evaluation models, and identification procedures. Maryland has a long history of involvement in gifted and talented education. In Maryland's early history (1975-1980), the state was the recipient of federal funds for demonstration centers and leadership training support from the N/S-LTI-G/T. As a result, one of our greatest strengths is the many people in school systems that have a high degree of expertise and have persistently refined their programs over the years.

The Criteria for Excellence-Guidelines for Gifted and Talented Programs was written in collaboration with school system coordinators of gifted and talented programs in 1983. These criteria define quality standards for the various components of a program and provide school systems with a basis for planning, evaluating, and refining their programs for gifted and talented students. This document was a response to the state's need for quality standards that are not defined or mandated in the current legislation. One of the greatest challenges Maryland faces is achieving uniform program quality and equity across the state, even though program delivery models and identification procedures vary. These standards hold the potential for advancing all of Maryland's programs if incentives can be offered to encourage voluntary compliance.

To emphasize the quality of school year programs, the state has undertaken several initiatives that will continue and be expanded upon in the future. Guidebooks will be developed to accompany the Criteria for Excellence. These guidebooks will address the major components of a gifted and talented program and will serve as resource guides to teachers, principals, and supervisors in implementing and revising programs. In addition, grants will be offered to LEAs to support programs in different stages of

MARYLAND (continued)

development. Planning grants for LEAs still at an initial stage of development will be implemented, as well as grants for innovative projects in LEAs with advanced programs.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Dr. Lynn Cole
Chief, Learning Improvement Section
State Department of Education
200 W. Baltimore St.
Baltimore, MD 21201
(301) 333-2357

State organizations include:

Maryland Coalition for Gifted and Talented Education

Contact: Mrs. Kathay Parker
1189 Wayne Ave.
Hagerstown, MD 21740

MASSACHUSETTS

Currently, the greatest strength in Massachusetts gifted programs is the local diversity.

Two areas relative to programming for the gifted which need improvement are programs for bilingual and minority students.

Expansion efforts could encourage business partnerships.

During the 1986-87 school year, state funding for gifted has fared well. In addition, the 1986 Education Reform Bill requires the SEA to collect data annually on programs and practices for gifted and talented.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Roselyn Frank, Director
Office of Gifted and Talented
Massachusetts Department of Education
Bureau of Curriculum Services
1385 Hancock St.
Quincy, MA 02169

State organizations include:

Massachusetts Association for the Advancement of Individual Potential
Clista Dow, President
Sharon Public Schools
Sharon, MA
(617) 784-6717

MICHIGAN

Michigan has adopted the federal definition of Gifted and Talented as defined in 1978 by the U.S. Office of Education, Public Law 95-561, Title IX, Part A, Section 902.

A major strength of Michigan's Gifted and Talented Programs is the current focus on Comprehensive Programming, incorporating the areas of Planning and Administration, Staff Development, Identification, Defined Program and Evaluation. A second strength would be the flourishing of programs under local district control. Gifted education in Michigan is a permissive function by districts; not a program mandated by state legislation. Another significant strength is the presence of qualified gifted/talented consultants in virtually all intermediate school districts throughout the state providing leadership, training, and resources to local districts.

Michigan's needs include increased training to ensure qualified leaders; a unified approach to identification and program guidelines; contact people in each local school district to coordinate activities; and an administrative budget for gifted education within the Michigan Department of Education.

At the state level, Michigan has the potential for expansion in the areas of leadership, university programs in gifted/talented education, research, and model programs within the state. An increase in funding for local districts, intermediate school districts, and special options is needed to ensure the continuance of quality programs. At the local level, potential exists for the comprehensive programming of students through proper assessment and the availability of multiple program options. The identification of underrepresented groups is another area needing growth. Expansion in these areas are major goals for Michigan's gifted/talented programs.

Michigan continues to move forward in programming for its gifted and talented students, showing an increase in the number and variety of opportunities available in local districts. Needs continue to exist at both the state and local levels, but a positive trend is being witnessed.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Nancy Mincemoyer, Coordinator
Programs for Gifted and Talented
Michigan Department of Education
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909
(517) 373-3279

MICHIGAN (continued)

State organizations include:

Michigan Association for the Academically Talented (MAAT)
Harriet O'Brien, President
2445 O'Brien Rd.
Mayville, MI 48744
Mary Lou Angelotti, Membership
2209 Belaire
Midland, MI 48640

Michigan Association of Educators for the Gifted, Talented, and Creative (MAECTC)
Dr. Fay Carney, President
Shiawassee ISD
Corunna, MI 48817
Robert Hayduk, Membership
4282 Augustine
Sterling Heights, MI 48077

The Academy for the Gifted and Talented of Michigan
Roxanne Reschke, President
Oakland ISD
2100 Pontiac Lake Rd.
Pontiac, MI 48054
Dr. Richard Watson, Membership
Oakland ISD
2100 Pontiac Lake Rd.
Pontiac, MI 48054

MINNESOTA

Minnesota educators have developed a wide variety of options for gifted/talented students. These include magnet and special focus schools, talent pool classes, mentorships, cluster grouping, advanced classes, International Baccalaureate, and participation in many academic competitions.

However, more opportunities for gifted/talented students in rural schools should be explored. This may include the use of technology, pairing, and more flexible use of human and material resources.

A strong wave is evidenced in supporting a broad definition of gifted/talented. Program options for creative/productive thinkers and leaders are being developed.

Since the 1979 legislation which established categorical aid for gifted/talented, the number of gifted/talented students has increased yearly.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Sarah Smith, Program Specialist
Gifted Education
State Department of Education
641 Capitol Square
St. Paul, MN 55101
(612) 296-4072

State organizations include:

MCGT
Neannie Knox
5701 Normandale Rd.
Edina, MN 55424

MEGT
Barbara Christenson
North St. Paul Schools
2055 E. Larpenteur Ave.
North St. Paul, MN 55109

MISSISSIPPI

Gifted and talented children means children and youth who are identified at the preschool, elementary, or secondary level as possessing demonstrated or potential abilities that give evidence of high performance capability in areas such as intellectual, creative, specific academic, or leadership ability, or in the visual and performing arts, and who by reason thereof, require educational services or activities not ordinarily provided by the school.

Intellectually Gifted
Definition: Intellectually gifted are individuals identified as possessing demonstrated or potentially high intellectual ability. Disadvantaged gifted are individuals who demonstrate high intellectual potential, but might not have had an opportunity to develop their mental capacities because of external influences.

Eligibility Criteria: Must have two measures of intelligence; one of which must be an IQ of 120 or above, or the 95th percentile or above on one of five specified individually administered intelligence tests.

Talented Academically
Definition: Academically talented are those individuals possessing specific academic aptitude beyond the norm in achievement in one or more academic areas to the extent that they need and profit from advanced content studies in both greater depth and rapid acceleration.

Eligibility Criteria: Must have at least three test scores from standardized group or individual tests, one of which must be a national test.

Talented in Visual and/or Performing Arts
Definition: Individuals who possess exceptional ability in the visual and/or performing arts; who demonstrate outstanding aesthetic production or creativity in the areas of art, dance, music, speech, and/or drama and in activities requiring possession of exceptional gross or fine manipulative and motor skills proceeding from mental stimuli.

Eligibility Criteria: Must have samples of their work judged by experts and/or audition for experts in the talent area. The experts must make some statement of their findings which indicates that they believe the student is unusually or highly talented in that particular talent area.

MISSISSIPPI (continued)

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Genanne Kelley-Miller, Consultant
Programs for Gifted and Talented
Mississippi Department of Education
Bureau of Special Services
P.O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205-0771
(601) 359-3490

State organizations include:

Mississippi Association for Talented and Gifted
Suzanne Meriweather, President
2501 West 7th St.
Hattiesburg, MS 39401

MISSOURI

Currently, the greatest strength in Missouri gifted programs is state funding.

There continues to be a need for providing information to the general public.

Expansion efforts could be directed toward summer programs and special models during the regular school year.

During the 1986-87 school year, Missouri has seen a 20% increase in gifted/talented programs.

Over the past two years, data has been collected from the 300 students each year who attend the Scholar's Academy. This data is available to the general public for research.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Robert Roach, Director
Gifted Education Programs
State Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
P.O. Box 480
100 East Capitol
Jefferson City, MO 65102
(314) 751-2453

State organizations include:

Gifted Association of Missouri
Dr. Ella Jones, President
4074 Avery Lane
Bridgeton, MO 63044

MONTANA

Currently, the greatest strengths in Montana gifted programs are: (a) networking between school districts, especially at the teacher training level; (b) advocacy from parents and educators; and (c) local funding, as 48 programs receive partial support from the State and 82 districts totally support their own programs.

Areas which relate to programming for the gifted which need improvement include: (a) legislation with a fiscal note to mandate gifted education; (b) university level training for teachers; (c) administrative acceptance of gifted education; and (d) financial support for summer related activities for gifted students (i.e. a Governor's School).

Expansion efforts should be directed toward working more closely with business and industry and in the use of telecommunication for the instruction of advanced placement courses.

During the 1986-87 school year, districts have primarily "maintained" their status. Budgets were cut, and services to gifted students have decreased a small amount.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Nancy Lukenbill, Specialist
Gifted and Talented Program
Office of Public Instruction
State Capitol
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-4422

State organizations include:

Montana Association for Gifted and Talented Education
Mike Anderson, Principal
White Sulphur Springs School District
White Sulphur Springs, MT 59645

NEBRASKA

The term "gifted children" shall mean children who excel markedly in ability to think, reason, judge, invent, or create and who need special facilities and services in order to assist them to achieve more nearly their potentials for their own sakes as individuals and for the increased contributions they may make to the community, state, and nation.

Currently, the greatest strengths in Nebraska gifted programs include: (a) the inclusive nature of programs; (b) districts are beginning to consider needs of minority and culturally deprived gifted students; and (c) curriculum development at the local level.

Areas which relate to programming for the gifted which need attention include increased funding and the need for more teachers to be trained in education of the gifted.

Expansion efforts could be directed toward identification and services based on leadership abilities and talents in the visual and performing arts.

During the 1986-87 school year, there was an increase in the number of gifted programs in Nebraska.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Sheila Brown, Supervisor
Programs for the Gifted
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 94987
300 Centennial Mall South
Lincoln, NE 68509
(402) 471-4337

State organizations include:

Nebraska Association for Gifted
Roxana O'Gara
9756 Ascot Dr.
Omaha, NE 68114

NEVADA

Academically talented means superior intellectual development and/or outstanding talent which makes the child capable of high performance, including demonstrated achievement or potential. Differentiated educational programs and/or services are required beyond those normally provided by the regular school program to enable the child to realize contributions to self and society.

Local school districts in Nevada provide very good programs with minimal funds.

Improvement is needed through coordination at the state level, including personnel and funds for statewide meetings.

Expansion efforts should be directed toward providing services to the gifted and talented rather than limiting services to the academically talented.

During the 1986-87 school year, Nevada's summer residential programs were initiated.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Dr. Jane Early, Director
Special Education Programs
Nevada Department of Education
400 West King St.
Carson City, NV 89710
(702) 885-3140

NEW HAMPSHIRE

"Gifted and talented children are those with outstanding abilities who are capable of high performance. These are students who require differentiated educational programs and/or services beyond those normally provided by the regular school curriculum.

These students include those with demonstrated achievement and/or potential ability in any of the following areas, singly or in combination: (1) general intellectual ability; 2) specific academic aptitude; (3) creative or productive thinking; (4) leadership ability; (5) visual and performing arts."

Currently, the greatest strengths in New Hampshire gifted programs are: (a) strong support from the Governor, Legislature, State Board of Education, and State Department of Education; (b) local ownership for locally developed/implemented programming; and (c) teacher training efforts, such as the Governor's Institute in Gifted Education.

Areas which relate to programming for the gifted which need improvement include: (a) greater commitment of local resources for consistent level of gifted education programming throughout the state; and (b) more effective evaluation strategies and techniques.

Expansion efforts could be directed toward (a) university/college graduate degree programs in gifted education; (b) district-wide community resource networks; and (c) efforts to blend gifted education with the regular school program.

During the 1986-87 school year, many schools have started planning programming, while others have worked to update and strengthen their options. Most districts have had inservice presentations on some aspect of gifted education such as creative/critical thinking, problem solving, expanding enrichments, opportunities, etc.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Susan H. Newton, Consultant
Office of Special Education
New Hampshire State Department of Education
State Office Park South
101 Pleasant St.
Concord, NH 03301
(603) 271-3452

State organizations include:

SAGE
Box 556
Hampstead, NH 03841
Contact: Mary White

NEW JERSEY

Currently, the greatest strengths in New Jersey gifted programs are teacher commitment and program expansion.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include teacher training and identification of minorities and underachieving gifted students.

Expansion efforts could be directed toward curriculum development, teacher training, evaluation, identification, legislation, and funding.

During the 1986-87 school year, legislation passed unanimously by both the Assembly and Senate to provide categorical funding for the gifted was vetoed by the governor.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Jeanne Carlson
Education Program Specialist
Division of General Academic Education
Department of Education
225 West State St.
CN 500
Trenton, NJ 08625-0500
(609) 633-7180

State organizations include:

Gifted Child Society, Gina Ginsberg Riggs
90 Rock Road
Glen Rock, NJ
(201) 444-7530

NJEGT, Barbara Strobert, President
95 Franklin St.
Seeaucus, NJ
(201) 783-4000

NEW MEXICO

"Gifted child" means a school-age person whose measured intelligence quotient, either verbal or nonverbal, measures at least two standard deviations above the mean on an intelligence test approved by the state board and who meets at least one of the following additional criteria:

(1) "score of at least the ninety-fifth percentile and above the total battery score on a standardized achievement test approved by the State Board;

(2) outstanding creativity or divergent thinking as established in the educational standards for New Mexico schools; and

(3) outstanding critical thinking or problem-solving ability as defined in the educational standards for New Mexico schools."

Currently, the greatest strengths in New Mexico gifted programs relate to the fact that they are developed on the basis of individual need and implemented in conformance with an individualized educational program.

Areas in programming for the gifted which need improvement include inservice training, curriculum development, and regular education initiatives regarding gifted education.

Expansion efforts could be directed toward mentorships, grade and subject acceleration, and enrichment within the regular program.

Because of the mandated exceptionality criteria legislated in 1986, there has been a decrease in the number of students receiving special education services under gifted. The State Department of Education is collecting data on the effect of the 1986 state legislature mandate specifying eligibility criteria. The information has not yet been summarized.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Barbara Michael
Special Education
Education Building
Santa Fe, NM 87501-2786
(505) 827-6541

NEW YORK

Currently, the greatest strengths in New York gifted programs are the availability of gifted programs in virtually every district in the state, and the training of teachers of the gifted and regular classroom teachers which has gone on over the past six years.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include: (a) integrating special provisions, such as development of thinking skills, into the content areas; (b) obtaining greater representation of minority students, handicapped students, and (in some subjects) female students; (c) expanding programs into the lower grades; and (d) linking gifted programs in the middle grades to high school programs, such as honors classes and advanced placement.

Expansion efforts should be directed toward special regional high schools for gifted students.

During the 1986-87 school year, there has been an increase of 36 percent in state funding for gifted programs. In some instances, the broad educational reform taking place in the state of New York has made it more difficult to implement programs for the gifted.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

David Irvine, Coordinator
Gifted Education
State Education Department
Room 314-B EB
Albany, NY 12234
(518) 474-5966

State organizations include:

AGATE (Advocacy for Gifted and Talented Education)
Mrs. Patricia Davies, Executive Secretary
8084 East Seneca Turnpike
Manlius, NY 13104

NORTH CAROLINA

Academically gifted programs are legislatively mandated in North Carolina and included within the Division for Exceptional Children. Funding provisions are included within the mandate. Program growth has been continuous since the late 1950's and statewide identification standards have been in place since 1978. Approximately 6% of the school age population is being served in the academically gifted program. One state-level consultant is assigned to the program (100%). Certification in gifted education is required of any teacher who works with an identified class of academically gifted students. The Division for Exceptional Children also administers the Governor's Schools of North Carolina, the nation's oldest state-supported residential summer program for 800 high school juniors and seniors. Separate funding and legislation established the North Carolina School of Science and Mathematics (1980) and the North Carolina School of the Arts (1963). Two statewide advocacy groups are active and jointly sponsor an annual conference on gifted education.

Programs and services, staff development, and evaluation of program quality and funding are three areas that need improvement but also have the potential for expansion and improvement. Across North Carolina, programs and services are being better defined by the development of curriculum scope and sequence. What began in a small percentage of the 140 school systems has become a recognized need in others. Staff development for regular program teachers continues to be needed, especially for content area teachers who may have gifted and high ability students in the same class. The development of a local plan for gifted programs is increasingly viewed as a priority by educators and advocacy groups--a plan that includes expansion of services, curriculum scope and sequence, and staff development. A summative program evaluation model is available for school systems to use as a basis for the development of a local plan. Increased funding is needed and, with more clearly defined and planned gifted programs, the possibility increases for more funds.

The scope of North Carolina's programs has been expanded during the 1986-87 school year as school systems include services in a variety of content areas and provide staff development activities for educational purposes.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Gail Smith, Chief Consultant
Academically Gifted Programs
Division for Exceptional Children
State Department of Public Instruction
Raleigh, NC 27611
(919) 733-3004

NORTH CAROLINA (continued)

State organizations include:

North Carolina Association for Gifted and Talented
Dr. Linda Morris
1756 Stonewood Dr.
Winston-Salem, NC 27103

North Carolina Parents for the Advancement of Gifted Education
Dr. Don Russell
900 Brintonial Way
Winston-Salem, NC 27104

NORTH DAKOTA

Gifted child means a gifted or talented child, identified by a qualified professional as a student who, by virtue of outstanding abilities, is capable of high performance and who requires differentiated educational programs and services beyond those normally provided by the regular school program in order to realize his contribution to self and society.

Currently, the greatest strengths in North Dakota gifted programs are developing research skills and products, and enrichment.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include: (a) coordination with regular education; (b) differentiated curriculum tailored to suit unique needs; and (c) secondary programs. Expansion efforts should be directed toward inservice and technical assistance to regular education teachers.

During the 1986-87 school year, existing programs maintained their present status.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Ida Schmitt, Assistant Director
Special Education
Department of Public Instruction
State Capitol
Bismarck, ND 58505
(701) 224-2277

State organizations include:

Gifted Education Network
Pat Swanson
Campus School
Minot State University
Minot, ND 58701

OHIO

Currently, the greatest strengths in Ohio gifted programs are: (a) coordinator's network of more than 250 persons; (b) validation of teaching certification for gifted; and (c) state associations.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include continued increase in funding and programs for visual and performing arts.

Expansion efforts could be directed toward the number of teachers per district and scope and range (age and grade) of students served.

During the 1986-87 school year, there was a minor increase in the number of programs and a major increase in quality.

Currently, a statewide study has been undertaken to analyze underachieving gifted students.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

George Fitchter
Educational Consultant
Programs for Gifted
Division of Special Education
933 High Street
Worthington, OH 43085
(614) 466-2650

State organizations include:

Ohio Association for Gifted Children
Dr. Juanita Roderick, President
School of Education
Youngstown State University
Youngstown, OH 44555

Consortium of Ohio Coordinators for Gifted
Dr. Doug Sebring, President
North Olmsted School
North Olmsted, OH 44070

OKLAHOMA

The greatest strength in Oklahoma gifted programs is based on the way Oklahomans have a willingness to serve and help one another. This caring and sharing has strengthened gifted education.

There is a need for improvement in Oklahoma teacher training practices. Presently, a process is being prepared to develop an endorsement in gifted education.

Expansion efforts in Oklahoma could be directed toward all areas. The one area that has shown growth is a rural networking system.

The drop in oil prices during the 1986-87 school year has hurt the state greatly. There has also been a reduction in the number of full-time gifted teachers.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Dorothy Dodd, Administrator
Gifted/Talented Section
State Department of Education
2500 N. Lincoln Blvd.
Oklahoma City, OK 73105
(405) 521-4287

State organizations include:

Oklahoma Association for Creative, Gifted, Talented
Dr. Diane Montgomery
Elmhurst School
10105 N. Pennsylvania
Oklahoma City, OK 73120

OREGON

"Talented and gifted children" means those children who require special educational programs or services, or both, beyond those normally provided by the regular school program in order to realize their contribution to self and society and who demonstrate outstanding ability or potential in one or more of the following areas:
1. General intellectual ability as commonly measured by measures of intelligence and aptitude.
2. Unusual academic ability in one or more academic areas.
3. Creative ability in using original or non-traditional methods in thinking and producing.
4. Leadership ability in motivating the performance of others either in educational or non-educational settings.
5. Ability in the visual or performing arts, such as dance, music, or art.

While programs for TAG students are not required, one-third of the districts in Oregon representing about one-half the population provide such programs. Nearly $5,000,000 is budgeted for these programs for local districts even under difficult financial circumstances. There is a good network for sharing of ideas and models.

Districts without programs or services need to be assisted toward quality services. The elimination of barriers for TAG students is essential. Early recognition and programming for young students, extremely gifted students, and those at-risk needs to be accomplished. Administrative inservice for building leadership should be improved.

Expansion efforts should be directed toward: (a) summer residential programs (especially at the secondary level); (b) fast paced math (Johns Hopkins model); (c) interactive video for remote/small school districts; and (d) focus on underachieving gifted/at-risk.

During the 1986-87 school year, there has been steady funding and maintenance of programs. Some programs are identifying and serving sub-populations and improving services.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Julie Hammerstad
Gifted/Talented Specialist
700 Pringle Parkway, S.E.
Salem, OR 97219
(503) 378-4765

OREGON (continued)

State organizations include:

Oregon Association for Talented and Gifted
Margi DeBuss, President
Bev Phelps, Secretary
P.O. Box 1703
Beaverton, OR 97075

128

PENNSYLVANIA

Currently, the greatest strengths in Pennsylvania gifted programs are: (a) statewide standards; (b) IEPs; and (c) the right to a due process hearing.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include breadth and scope of curriculum and teacher training.

Expansion efforts should be directed toward pre-professional, vocational, and avocational experiences and training and cooperation in programming for the gifted with public/higher education.

During the 1986-87 school, there has been expansion in curriculum development and increased emphasis on teacher certification.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Gary Makuch, Director
Bureau of Special Education
Department of Education
333 Market St.
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333
(717) 783-6913

State organizations include:

PAGE (Pennsylvania Association for Gifted Education)
3028 Potshop Road
Norristown, PA 19403
(215) 584-1991

RHODE ISLAND

Currently, the greatest strength in Rhode Island gifted programs is permissive legislation. In less than 10 years, Rhode Island has 37 out of 40 LEAs involved in gifted and talented education.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include identifying and serving all gifted/talented students, and the development of a preservice and graduate training program with emphasis on gifted/talented education.

Efforts should be directed toward expansion of programs in grades K-12, both vertically and horizontally.

During the 1986-87 school year, the state of Rhode Island has survived several newspaper articles. New legislation also allowed $50,000 for funding secondary programs.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Judy Edsal, Education Specialist
Gifted/Talented Education
Department of Elementary/Secondary Education
22 Hayes St.
Providence, RI 02908
(401) 277-6523

SOUTH CAROLINA

Currently, the greatest strengths in South Carolina gifted programs include a commitment to the arts and recognition of underachieving gifted.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include teacher training and providing services to artistically gifted and talented students.

Expansion efforts could be directed toward the arts (dance, drama, music, visual arts) and guidance support services.

During the 1986-87 school year, there has been increased funding and an increase in the number of students served.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Anne H. Elam, Coordinator
Programs for the Gifted
802 Rutledge Building
1429 Senate St.
Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 734-8385

State organizations include:

South Carolina Consortium for the Gifted
Ms. Suzanne McDaniel
Spartanburg School District Seven
P.O. Box 970
Spartanburg, SC 29304

SOUTH DAKOTA

Gifted is defined as "students who have a demonstrated ability or potential for academic accomplishment that is outstanding in comparison to their peer group and whose educational needs cannot be met with modification of the regular curriculum.

The South Dakota gifted and talented program is incorporated within special education. South Dakota also uses a non-categorical approach in providing special assistance to students who, because of their educational needs, do not profit from the usual curriculum and instructional program. At present, most of the gifted students are served in "programs" such as Olympics of the Mind, Great Book seminars, Future Problem Solving, mentorships, and an Enrichment Triad Model. While these programs are beneficial, they do inhibit individualization of instruction as per a special education individualized educational program (IEP).

The local school districts for the 1986-87 school year reported 4,791 students, or 3.84% of the total school enrollment, as having approved IEPs in special education.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Deborah Barnett, Assistant Director
Special Education Section
Richard F. Kneip Building
700 N. Illinois
Pierre, SD 57501
(605) 773-3678

State organizations include:

TAG/CEC
Ms. Joan Dunmier
Douglas School District, Patriot Dr.
Ellsworth AFB, SD 57706-9701

TENNESSEE

Currently, the greatest strengths in Tennessee gifted programs are stable funding and the level of motivation of teachers and other program personnel to provide good programs.

Needs include additional training for teachers, permanent appropriate standards for teachers of the gifted, and technical assistance to local school systems in program development.

Expansion efforts should be directed toward systematic screening, preschool programs, and summer programs.

During the 1986-87 school year, Tennessee has seen continued moderate steady growth.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Emily Stewart, Director
Gifted/Talented Programs and Services
132-A Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, TN 37219
(615) 741-0662

TEXAS

A state mandate was passed during the last legislative session which requires all 1,100 school districts in Texas to have K-12 programs for gifted students by 1990-91.

While teachers are trained and programs are developed in grades 3-8, primary and secondary school programs are very scarce. There is a need for more training in those areas as well as in meeting the needs of disadvantaged gifted students.

All areas within education of the gifted continue to have room for growth.

During the 1986-87 school year, gifted programs have faired pretty well. Research in education of the gifted has progressed through Chapter 2 discretionary funding to research and develop Institutes for Teachers of the Young (K-2) and Disadvantaged Gifted.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Ann Shaw/Evelyn Hiatt
Gifted/Talented Education
Texas Education Agency
1701 Congress Ave.
Austin, TX 78701
(512) 463-9455

State organizations include:

Texas Association for the Gifted/Talented
Laura Allard, Ex. Director
P.O. Box 9802, #814
Austin, TX 78766

UTAH

Gifted and talented students are those students whose abilities and potentials for accomplishment are so outstanding that they require more challenging educational programs to meet their needs in one or more of the following areas:

1. INTELLECTUAL: Students with high aptitude for abstract reasoning and conceptualization who are curious about a variety of things and are alert and observant.

2. ACADEMIC: Students who evidence extraordinary learning ability in one or more specific disciplines.

3. VISUAL, PERFORMING, OR PSYCHO-MOTOR ARTS: Students who are consistently superior in the development of a product or performance in any of the visual, performing, or psycho-motor arts.

4. PRACTICAL ARTS: Students who excel in the development of a product or performance in any area of vocational/technical education.

5. LEADERSHIP: Students who exhibit keen sensitivity to self and others, and who are accepted as leaders. Such children and youth demonstrate high ability to accomplish group goals by working with and through others.

6. CREATIVITY: Students who are highly insightful, imaginative, and innovative; who consistently engage in differentiating, integrating, and generalizing seemingly unrelated information to formulate new and novel solutions to conventional tasks.

7. PSYCHO-SOCIAL: Children and youth who demonstrate a natural capacity to love, to understand, to empathize, to be compassionate, and to be of service. Those who have the "gift of caring."

Currently, the greatest strength of Utah gifted programs is the local school district initiative. There are 8 to 10 outstanding district programs for gifted/talented students.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include maintaining quality, and having ongoing programs even on a small basis.

Expansion efforts should be directed in all areas. Utah's major focus has been on "specific academic," however, other areas are much in need of expansion.

UTAH (continued)

As of 1987-88, gifted/talented in Utah has been combined with advanced placement and concurrent enrollment under the title of Accelerated Learning Programs. This practice puts more emphasis at the secondary level, but on a fairly narrow basis, and takes from gifted/talented generally.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Keith D. Steck
State Consultant for Gifted
State Office of Education
250 E. 5th South
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
(801) 533-5572

State organizations include:

Utah Association for G/T Children
State Affiliate of NAGC
Dr. Robert Fineman, Chair
2635 Glenna Drive
Salt Lake City, UT 84117

VERMONT

Currently, the greatest strengths in Vermont gifted programs are the abilities to look at individual students and student needs rather than student test scores.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include funding and legislation.

Expansion efforts could be directed toward teacher certification and training.

During the 1986-87 school year, programs for the gifted have remained the same as in the past. The state department, however, has developed a preschool screening program for incoming kindergarten students.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Donna D. Brinkmeyer
Arts/Gifted Consultant
State Department of Education
Montpelier, VT 05602
(802) 828-3111

State organizations include:

Council for Education of the Gifted, Creative, and Talented
Margaret Snelgrove, President
Mt. Abraham Union High School
Bristol, VT 05442

VIRGINIA

Currently, the greatest strengths in Virginia gifted programs are: (a) newly mandated regulations; (b) proposed certification standards; and (c) an increase in teacher training programs.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include: (a) identification (minimum criteria); (b) curriculum standards; and (c) increased time for students to be in gifted programs with trained teachers.

Expansion efforts should be directed toward program evaluation and monitoring, and implementing program standards.

During the 1986-87 school year, there was program growth and increased state funding for the gifted.

The state of Virginia has been involved in a study to identify students for technical arts (vocational) and curriculum development for technical arts.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Deborah Bellflower/John D. Booth
Virginia Department of Education
P.O. Box 6Q
Richmond, VA 23216-2060
(804) 225-2070

Virginia Association for the Gifted (VAEG)
Dr. Ed Brown
Virginia Beach City Schools
Virginia Beach, VA 23456-0038

Northern Virginia Council for the Gifted
Mrs. Gail Hubbard
Prince William County Schools
P.O. Box 389
Barrocks/Manassas, VA 22110

WASHINGTON

Currently, the greatest strengths in Washington gifted programs are: (a) the diversity in program options; (b) local control; (c) level of LEA participation in a permissive state funded program; and (d) the quality of educators involved.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include identification and programming options available for special populations, and teacher certification/endorsement for gifted.

Expansion efforts should be directed toward funding of special projects, and development of statewide leadership.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Gail Hanninen, State Coordinator
Programs for the Gifted
Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building FG-11
Olympia, WA 98504
(206) 753-2858

State organizations include:

WAETAG - JoAnn Simms, President
16125 N.E. 95th Ct.
Redmond, WA 98052

NWGCA - Dr. Jan McDonald
P.O. Box 1226
Bellevue, WA 98009

WEST VIRGINIA

Currently, the greatest strength in West Virginia gifted programs lies in the fact that the West Virginia Board of Education has established, as one of its priorities, to redefine/restructure gifted education.

An area which relates to programming for the gifted in which action for improvement has been implemented is in the process of redefining/restructuring gifted education to focus on academic excellence.

Expansion efforts should be directed toward a focus on academic excellence.

During the 1986-87 school year, the State Board established education of the gifted as a priority and funding was continued for the West Virginia Governor's Honors Academy.

Policy Issues-Intellectually Gifted Students: Issues and Policy Implications is a study which was recently completed by Craig Howley of the Appalachia Education Laboratory. This project was funded by OERI, U.S. Department of Education.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Nancy Thabet, Coordinator
Programs for the Gifted
357 B, Capitol Complex
Charleston, WV 25305
(304) 348-2696

WISCONSIN

Currently, the greatest strengths in Wisconsin gifted programs are diversity and local control.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include inter-district cooperative programs and teacher preservice/inservice education.

Expansion efforts should be directed toward collaborative efforts between schools, colleges, and technology.

There was growth in programs for the gifted in Wisconsin during the 1986-87 school year.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Peter Burke
School Improvement Office
P.O. Box 7841
125 S. Webster
Madison, WI 53707
(608) 267-2063

State organizations include:

Wisconsin Association of Educators of G/T
Hope Erickson
Watertown School District
111 Dodge St.
Watertown, WI 53094

Wisconsin Council for G/T
Toini Mandelin, Exec. Secretary
3621 W. Allerton Ave.
Greenfield, WI 53221

WYOMING

Currently, the greatest strengths in Wyoming gifted programs are: (a) excellent leadership in local districts; (b) ability to adapt to reduced revenues; (c) strong advocacy groups; and (d) strong integration with regular classroom programs.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include more coherent programming, and more recognition by some administrators of the value of programs for the gifted to the individual district.

Expansion efforts could be directed toward more opportunities for teacher training and coursework for the regular teacher in differentiating curriculum for the gifted.

During the 1986-87 school year, several districts expanded or began new programs. Six programs were reduced or eliminated due to state and local budget cuts.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Nancy Leinius, Coordinator
Language Arts/Gifted/Talented
Wyoming Department of Education
Hathaway Building
Cheyenne, WY 82002
(307) 777-6226

State organizations include:

WAGE - Wyoming Association for Gifted Education
Sharon Boren
P.O. Box 400
Jackson, WY 83001

PUERTO RICO

Currently, the greatest strength of gifted programs in Puerto Rico is the way programs utilize the computer for the development of skills in English and mathematics.

Areas relating to programming for the gifted which need improvement include Spanish and mathematics.

Expansion efforts should be directed toward science and social studies.

During the 1986-87 school year, computers have been used in math and English.

The individual reporting information for this survey was:

Aida L. Torres de Nevarez
Office of External Resources
Department of Education
Hato Rey, PR 99024
(809) 754-1160

State organizations include:

University Inter-Americana

Mendez Foundation